

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 9826. A bill for the relief of Gunter Arno Thelerman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2396. By Mr. RICH: Petition of citizens of Clinton County, Pa., urging that there be written into any bills drafting our youth for war or military training provision that no alcoholic beverages may be served or sold in camps or within radius of 10 miles; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2397. By Mr. TAYLOR: Petition of the Parent-Teacher Association of Hoosick Falls, N. Y., that Anna Mary Robertson Moses be named and appointed as grandmother of the year for the whole United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2398. By the SPEAKER: Petition of George E. Miller, New York, N. Y., relative to a petition in the matter of judicial proceedings against Henry P. Chandler, as Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and Mortimer W. Byers, as United States district judge for the eastern district of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2399. Also, petition of V. D. Heyde, Delmenhorst, Germany, relative to abominable housing conditions existing in Delmenhorst; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2400. Also, petition of Frank Santiago Brito, Rio Piedras, P. R., relative to the attacks made on President Harry Truman and Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, of Puerto Rico, and family; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2401. Also, petition of Francis Jean Reuter, Silver Spring, Md., relative to a redress of grievances pertaining to compensations, payments for damages, and other earned moneys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1950

(Legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

At this altar of prayer which our fathers builded, we would be still and know that Thou art God. Forgive us that we talk so much and are silent so seldom; that we are in such constant motion and are so rarely still; that we depend so implicitly on the effectiveness of our own schemes and organization and so little on the power of Thy spirit.

Bewildered by the world's confusion and by the angry emotions of the time, we are tempted to lose certitude and stability and self-control. We would be true servants of Thy will in this troubled time. Teach us this and every day so to wait upon Thee that we may renew our strength, mount up with wings as eagles, run and not be weary, walk and not faint. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAYLOR, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, November 30, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR DOWNEY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a copy of the letter of resignation of the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
November 25, 1950.

HON. EARL WARREN,
Governor of California,
Sacramento, Calif.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: In conformity with the recent statement I made to you, I hereby tender my resignation as United States Senator from the State of California, effective midnight, November 30, 1950.

Sincerely,

SHERIDAN DOWNEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The letter of resignation will lie on the table.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. TAYLOR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Maybank
Anderson	Hill	Millikin
Benton	Hoey	Morse
Brewster	Holland	Murray
Bridges	Hunt	Neely
Butler	Ives	O'Connor
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capehart	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Carlson	Kem	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Leahy	Stennis
Donnell	Lehman	Taylor
Dworshak	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Eaton	McCarthy	Thye
Ellender	McClellan	Tobey
Flanders	McFarland	Tydings
Fulbright	McKellar	Watkins
George	McMahon	Wherry
Gillette	Magnuson	Wiley
Gurney	Malone	Young
Hayden	Martin	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Sen-

ate on official business as a representative of the United States to the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent by leave of the Senate as a delegate of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed as a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

CREDENTIALS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the credentials of LISTER HILL, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Alabama, a Senator from that State, for the term beginning January 3, 1951, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that, on the 7th day of November 1950, LISTER HILL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Alabama a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1951.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, James E. Folsom, and our seal hereto affixed at the capitol, in the city of Montgomery, this November 20, A. D. 1950.

JAMES E. FOLSOM,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL]

SIBYL POOL,
Secretary of State.

Mr. SCHOEPEL presented the credentials of FRANK CARLSON, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Kansas, a Senator from that State, for the term beginning January 3, 1951, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF KANSAS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1950 FRANK CARLSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Kansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1951.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, FRANK CARLSON, and our seal hereto affixed at Topeka, Kans., this 27th day of November A. D. 1950.

FRANK CARLSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL]

LARRY RYAN,
Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I present a certificate, in proper form, certifying to the election of my colleague the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The credentials will be read and placed on file.

The credentials were read and placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.
To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE
UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1950, WILLIAM BENTON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Connecticut a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired term of 6 years, ending January 2, 1953.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Chester Bowles, and our seal hereto affixed at Hartford, this 29th day of November A. D. 1950.

CHESTER BOWLES,
Governor.
WINIFRED McDONALD,
Secretary.

[SEAL]

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator-elect from Connecticut will come to the desk, the Chair will administer the oath of office to him.

Mr. BENTON, escorted by Mr. McMAHON, advanced to the desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Presiding Officer.

CREDENTIALS

Mr. BENTON presented the credentials of BRIEN McMAHON, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Connecticut, a Senator from that State, for the term beginning January 3, 1951, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.
To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED
STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1950, BRIEN McMAHON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Connecticut a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1951.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Chester Bowles, and our seal hereto affixed at Hartford, this 29th day of November A. D. 1950.

CHESTER BOWLES,
Governor.
WINIFRED McDONALD,
Secretary.

[SEAL]

Mr. KERR presented the credentials of MIKE MONRONEY, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Oklahoma a Senator from that State for the term beginning January 3, 1951, which were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Oklahoma City, November 20, 1950.
To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE
UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1950, MIKE MONRONEY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Oklahoma a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the

United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1951.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and seal at Oklahoma City, Okla., this 20th day of November A. D. 1950.

ROY J. TURNER.

By the Governor of the State of Oklahoma,
[SEAL] WILBURN CARTWRIGHT,
Secretary of State.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FLANDERS, because of official business, was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate on Monday next.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Eastern Dark Fired Tobacco Growers' Association, at Springfield, Tenn., relating to the internal affairs of that association; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from L. E. Barstow, of San Rafael, Calif., praying for the immediate removal of procommunists in the State Department; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Thirteenth Annual Convention of the Institute of Engineers of Puerto Rico, condemning the recent attempted assassination of President Truman; ordered to lie on the table.

NORTH AMERICAN REGIONAL BROADCASTING AGREEMENT—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL GRANGE, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a very important resolution adopted by unanimous vote of the National Grange at Minneapolis, Minn., November 17, 1950. This resolution concerns the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement and the National Grange opposition to it.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States Department of State signed on November 15, 1950, a North American radio treaty which permits Cuba the shared use of six specific United States clear channels and actually permits that nation to use all 24 United States clear channels, subject to only theoretical protection for our stations; and

Whereas the treaty permits, also, the shared use of clear channels in Jamaica and the Dominican Republic; and

Whereas nearby nations have received through a previous treaty and an interim agreement their fair share and in some cases, more than their fair share, of radio channels; and

Whereas the use of United States clear channels by foreign nations will cause interference to reception in rural areas in this country and also preclude at least on a number of clear channels the only means of improving rural radio coverage, namely through use of adequate power on clear-channel stations; and

Whereas these 24 clear channels have been the only medium through which most farm families have been afforded dependable night-

time radio service in areas remote from cities; and

Whereas city listeners in the United States have more than an adequate amount of radio broadcast coverage; and

Whereas the National Grange has gone on record many times in the past in favor of clear channels and sufficient power on them to better serve rural and small-town listeners: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Grange in annual session in Minneapolis, Minn., vigorously protests this treaty signed by the United States Department of State as a gross injustice to the rural families of the United States and instructs the Washington office to oppose its ratification by the United States Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION
INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. ECTON, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. NEELY):

S. 4215. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 4216. A bill for the relief of Fares Nujra Saliba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McMAHON introduced Senate bill 4217, to authorize a Federal civil-defense program and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 4218. A bill relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. CAIN) introduced Senate bill 4219, to authorize a Federal civil defense program and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution providing that a copy of the document entitled "Survival Under Atomic Attack" shall be furnished to every home in the United States; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I introduce at this time a bill for the creation of a Civil Defense Authority, and ask that it lie on the table for the present.

The bill (S. 4217) to authorize a Federal civil defense program and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McMAHON, was read twice by its title, and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KEFAUVER subsequently said: Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and myself, I introduce a bill to provide a Federal civil defense program, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). The bill seems to be identical, in purpose, with the bill which was introduced previously by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], which was ordered to lie on the table. The same course will be followed with respect to this bill.

The bill (S. 4219) to authorize a Federal civil defense program, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. CAIN), was read twice by its title, and ordered to lie on the table.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF FIELD OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 367), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 140, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to August 15, 1949 (providing for a study and investigation of the entire field of labor-management relations), is hereby continued through January 31, 1951.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF KOREA—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Significance of Korea," delivered by him at Calvary Episcopal Church, New York City, on October 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES AT MIDCENTURY HOMECOMING CONVOCATION OF WESTERN MARYLAND COLLEGE

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States, at the Midcentury Homecoming Convocation of Western Maryland College, at Westminster, Md., on November 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPORTANCE OF PROPAGANDA—ARTICLE BY FREDERICK C. MCKEE

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "Importance of Propaganda," written by Frederick C. McKee, chairman of the Committee on National Affairs, and published in the Washington Post of November 19, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—LETTER FROM VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF PENNSYLVANIA

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated November 28, 1950, addressed to him, by Louis George Feldmann, department commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Pennsylvania, on the subject of universal military training, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL JUDGE J. WATIES WARING—EDITORIAL FROM CHESTER (S. C.) REPORTER

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Judge Waring," published in the Chester (S. C.) Reporter, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE THREATENED DESTRUCTION OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Greatest Peril for United States," written by Hanson W. Baldwin, and published in the New York Times of December 1, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHIPMENTS TO COMMUNIST CHINA—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial en-

titled "Shipments to Red China," published in the New York Times of November 27, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM METHODIST COMMISSION ON WORLD PEACE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a message to Methodists in all lands, adopted by the Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church, in annual session at Chicago, Ill., on November 16-17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN POLICY IN KOREA—ARTICLE FROM CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. KERR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Wisdom Can Win," written by Erwin D. Canham, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of November 29, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CRISIS IN KOREA—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Matter of Life and Death," published in the Washington Evening Star of December 1, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. NEELY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Andrew J. Howard, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be associate justice of the municipal court for the District of Columbia; and

John A. Remon, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the term expiring March 3, 1955.

OUR FOREIGN PROBLEMS AND THEIR DANGERS—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the American people want to know the truth concerning our foreign problems and their dangers. They are capable of facing those dangers when they understand them. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tell Us the Truth," published in the Evening Star of November 30, 1950. The editorial comments on the radio address of Secretary of State Acheson on November 28. In my opinion, it expresses the very deep feelings of many citizens not only in Massachusetts, but all over the country at the present time. I base this statement on the number of telegrams and the amount of correspondence I have received. I hope that responsible administration officials will give us the facts as accurately and unreservedly as they can from time to time. In this way the support of the American people in a dangerous and difficult situation can be assured. I regret that the statements of our top officials have not done so sufficiently fully up to the present time.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELL US THE TRUTH

Secretary Acheson did not say the things that needed to be said in his talk to the people last night.

It was a good speech. In a less desperate period it would have been an admirable speech. The Secretary of State was spreading upon the record once again a statement of what it is that we are trying to do in this gravely menaced world. He was refuting once more the false accusation that our aim is not peace, but conquest. He was trying to appeal to the Chinese people over the heads of their savage, lying leaders. He was trying to stiffen the backbone of our wavering allies. And he was trying to impress our own people with an understanding of the gravity of the hour and the urgency of the need for united, courageous action.

Mr. Acheson faced up to the fact that the Chinese Communists and their Soviet collaborators have shown their willingness to accept the risk of war, and he said this makes it increasingly urgent for all American citizens to face squarely the danger that confronts us, and to give vigorous and united support to the measures we must take to meet this danger.

Well and good. But just what is the official estimate of the danger that confronts us? Does Mr. Acheson really cling to any lingering hope that we can engage in fruitful just negotiations with a Chinese government whose representatives, appearing before the United Nations, have shown themselves to be wholly devoid of any sense of truth or integrity? There is no foundation to support the slightest faith in the usefulness of negotiations with these people.

If Mr. Acheson no longer has faith in the tactic of negotiation with the Chinese or the Russians, and it is difficult to believe that he could have, what is the nature of the measures which he says must be taken and which he calls upon the people to support?

To state this matter briefly, Mr. Acheson, the President, or some appropriate official, should tell the American people the truth. The people have a right to know whether, in the best judgment of their Government, the prospect now is for war, not peace. Mr. Acheson did not declare himself on this point last night. Until someone takes his courage in hand and spreads the truth, or our best official estimate of the truth, upon the record, there is little point in calling upon the people to face up to a danger that has not been clearly defined, or in expecting them to support measures which, so far as they have been stated, are utterly inadequate if war is being forced upon us.

MR. TRUMAN'S HELPERS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Truman's Helpers," which appears in today's Washington Star. It ends with the following language:

The fate of the civilized world may well hang on the soundness of the decisions which Harry Truman will have to make, and, in the last analysis, he will have to make them alone, in consultation with his God and his heart and his conscience. He will have the sympathy and support of all thinking people, but there will be none to envy him.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. TRUMAN'S HELPERS

There are those who think that the President should pay more attention to advice

from the Senate in a time of great national crisis like the present. So, for whatever they may be worth, the Star has culled from the news columns the following offerings of senatorial opinion:

Senator CONNALLY, who is too old a hand to venture out on limbs that may be sawed off, thinks that the Security Council should be called upon to take appropriate action to bring about a quick showdown in Korea. Senator O'MAHONEY would serve the Russians with an ultimatum to get the Chinese troops out of Korea.

Senators BREWSTER and BRIDGES believe that General MacArthur should be given full authority to use the atom bomb if he thinks it is necessary. Senator CAIN says the Senate should demand that General MacArthur be given authority to send troops (he didn't say what troops) and planes across the Manchurian border. Senator FERGUSON urges that the United Nations give General MacArthur authority to wage all-out war, and Senator SMITH believes Chiang Kai-shek's troops should be thrown into the fight.

The chances are that the President will not find these suggestions very helpful. It might be simpler for him, though the result would be somewhat chaotic, if he could adopt all of them and then wash his hands of the whole business. But, as President, he cannot escape responsibility for the consequences of his judgments. The fate of the civilized world may well hang on the soundness of the decisions which Harry Truman will have to make, and, in the last analysis, he will have to make them alone, in consultation with his God and his heart and his conscience. He will have the sympathy and support of all thinking people, but there will be none to envy him.

SHIPS SOLD BY THE MARITIME COMMISSION TO THE CHINESE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. FLANDERS obtained the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Maine with the understanding, by mutual agreement, that he shall not read more than the statement he now holds in his hand.

Mr. BREWSTER. The very careful Senator from Vermont failed to limit me as to what I should say but limited me as to what I should read. However, I shall not take advantage of that technicality.

Mr. President, I read an item which deals with the question of the transfer of American matériel to the Chinese National Government, and in line therewith I wish to commend the extraordinary work of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] in connection with his investigation. I read as follows:

The Maritime Commission sold to the Chinese Nationalist Government 33 ships, 11 of which were operated by the China Union Line, the remaining 22 by the China Merchant Steam Navigation Co. Of these 33 ships, 3 were Victories, 9 Liberties, and the rest N-3's of 2,760 dead-weight tons each.

The crew of one Chinese ship turned Communist while it was in Singapore with a cargo of salt for SCAP. That ship still remains in that port. The crew of six other ships, consisting of one Liberty and five N-3's, defected in Hong Kong January 16, 1950. Nine months later, September 16, 1950, the six ships in Hong Kong sailed for Canton, where they are now actually in the hands of the Chinese Communist government.

In this 9-month period the American State Department conducted active and aggressive negotiations with the British authorities in Singapore, Hong Kong, and London to ob-

tain control of these ships to protect the Maritime Administration's mortgages. The British, from Foreign Minister Pevin down, refused to recognize American representations and the Maritime Administration was denied the use of British Admiralty and other courts to test their claims because the British maintained that its recognition of Communist China gave to them sovereign immunity. Bevin refused to use their Order in Council, which is the highest decree that can be issued in Britain and which was used in the case of Chennault's airplanes to impound these ships for the United States Government. Mr. Rankin—

That is Mr. Karl Rankin, a diplomatic official of long service—

who is now our chief Foreign Service officer in Formosa, was consul general in Hong Kong during these negotiations and when these ships sailed for Canton, he cabled the State Department that this had come about with the—

I quote what purports to be the exact language of Mr. Rankin's report—

"tacit connivance of the British."

Three of the six ships which sailed from Hong Kong were bought from the Maritime Administration by the Export-Import Bank, which had advanced the money to Nationalist China and who now holds the mortgages. The Government departments involved in these negotiations are State, Army, the Export-Import Bank, and the Maritime Administration.

I hope the resolution offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] providing for a more thorough going investigation of transfers of vital and critical material to the Chinese Communists may be speedily considered and adopted.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me so I may respond to the statement just made by the Senator from Maine? It will not be a lengthy statement. It will be but one sentence or two.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield without losing the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I wish to say that the points made by the Senator from Maine are indeed well taken. I agree entirely with what he has stated with regard to the facts and his statement presents a very unfortunate situation, to say the least.

It probably would be unwise to go into any further detail at this minute, other than to state that this matter has been receiving the attention of the subcommittee previously appointed. As a matter of fact, an executive hearing has been held in regard to the matter, and I can give assurance to the Senator from Maine, who is so interested in this question, and to other Senators, that it will continue to receive the careful and serious attention it deserves.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT RESPECTING USE OF THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, there was in the minds of all of us, I am sure, a sudden and serious surprise when it was reported yesterday morning that the President was considering the use of the atomic bomb in the Chinese situation. Most fortunately more complete reports

and later explanations took the edge off what had seemed to be a sudden and serious decision.

The importance of decision to use the atomic bomb was recognized by all Senators and Representatives interviewed. The opinions ranged all the way from dropping one now on the Kremlin to reserving its use for only very desperate situations. My own position was correctly reported in the news in the statement that "I would favor using it against the Chinese invaders only if the United Nations Assembly should order and approve of it." I want to amplify this point of view in a very few words. I will, however, say that I would not now use the word "order," but would leave in the word "approve."

The decision as to using the bomb is by law in the hands of the President. We must clear in our own minds that his decision will not be made solely by virtue of his office as Commander in Chief of our military forces but by virtue of his office as the President of this great Nation, and keeping in view all of its responsibilities and relations with the rest of the world. The decision as to whether to use the bomb is more than a military question and must not be decided on purely military grounds. The question of "whether" is in the hands of the President as a civil authority. Only the questions of "when" and "how" are military questions, if the "whether" has been decided affirmatively.

The importance of moral and political considerations is emphasized by the consternation in Europe over the first incorrect report of the news. The teeming cities of western Europe are interested parties in the determination, for they lie within easy range of the entrenched citadel of aggression in Moscow. It is this consideration which leads to urging that this be made a matter of United Nations policy rather than taking the full responsibility ourselves.

We have, indeed, to decide as to whether this conflict in Korea is in reality a United Nations undertaking or is so in form only. If the latter is the case, then we must be prepared to run the world alone on our own resources, on our own responsibilities, with our own treasure, and with the unsupported lives of our own young men. If, however, this is really a United Nations undertaking, most certainly so serious a decision as to the use of the bomb must have United Nations support. Fortunately, action on a question of this sort cannot be vetoed by Russia and its satellites if the Assembly has given consideration and made a recommendation.

This reference to and abiding by United Nations decision is, it would seem to me, a matter of proper foresight. We have hindsight as well to support making the United Nations authority real and effective.

Proposals were made for a neutral zone on the boundary between North Korea and Manchuria. Purely military consideration cast that proposal aside and our forces reached the Yalu River. If the news reports are to be believed, both England and France strongly favored withholding military action well short of the boundary river. We could

have done so in selected defensible positions and at the same time left less excuse even than now exists for the attack from Manchuria. We would have been better off militarily and politically as well. United Nations consultation would have saved us much.

The moral, to my mind, is that there is a large area in which military tactics and strategy must be subordinated to wise statesmanship, if such can be found within our own State Department or within the combined wisdom of the United Nations.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am reminded of the ancient adage that "a philosopher is one who can endure with equanimity the ills of others." From the safe security of the Vermont hills, I fear that the Senator from Vermont does not sufficiently appreciate the position of the 100,000 American boys now in the hills of North Korea, who are there certainly through no fault or responsibility of their own, and who are now faced with a Chinese horde pouring over them, and apparently are denied the use of the one weapon which might possibly be of some avail in saving the lives of thousands of those boys between now and Christmas, if authority were given to the military commander on the spot to exercise his own sound military judgment.

As the Senator from Vermont knows, the Senator from Maine suggested some time ago that in his judgment the President should exercise his authority, for undoubtedly the matter is within his discretion, to permit General MacArthur, who is in command of what are curiously termed the United Nations forces, although, outside of our South Korean allies, approximately 99 $\frac{4}{100}$ percent of them are American forces, to use the atom bomb if in his military judgment at any time it should be deemed expedient to do so.

It occurs to the Senator from Maine that it is possible that General MacArthur, who is on the spot, with the great responsibility he carries, is in a better position to determine the military problems involved.

As to the diplomatic problems involved, it is difficult to be patient with the continuing discussions at Lake Success and the United Nations, with the very men who are now responsible for the Chinese hordes pouring over the line from the safe sanctuary of Manchuria while Communists carry on a filibuster in the United Nations, with American boys dying while they talk.

The overwhelming response of the people of this country, judging from the telegrams and letters that are pouring into Washington, particularly those coming from the mothers of the boys who are now involved, and I refer particularly to the messages which are coming over my desk and over the desks of other Senators, are sufficient indication that the people of this country are becoming exceedingly impatient with these dilatory tactics while our boys are being sacrificed and crucified. It seems to me that the United Nations, in justice to its own existence and also in justice to the very great concern for the continued successful functioning of the United Nations which the Senator from Maine shares

with the Senator from Vermont, and has done so for the past 30 years, since the time when, as a young man, fresh from the First World War, I organized in Maine the League to Enforce Peace, hoping and looking fondly forward to the day when an association of the nations might carry out these responsibilities. However, what do we see now? We see the solemn farce and travesty occurring in the United Nations. Even the New York Herald Tribune and the New York Times, which are not susceptible of charges of being isolationist or reexamined, have recently pronounced in their editorials that the salvation not only of our own boys but of all our trained military personnel that is involved in the situation in North Korea today, requires a prompt end of the dilatory tactics of the diplomats in the United Nations or requires the United States to consider its responsibility to our own sons. After all, Mr. President, the British boys are not dying in any numbers; the French are not; all the others concerned are not; it is the American boys who are dying.

Meanwhile the only groups who have shown a readiness to cooperate—the Chinese Nationalists—we must not consider the use of. Why not permit the Chinese Nationalists, the Japanese, the Spanish, or the Germans to help us if they wish.

What is this strange mesmerism which has descended on the people of the world, this mesmerism created by a miasma of misrepresentation and deceit?

Why this distrust of Americans in positions of military authority—a fear by other Americans to entrust them with the welfare of American boys and the use of every weapon which may help the situation? I prefer to entrust their care in the hands and in the judgment of General MacArthur. Meanwhile not only the present force, but the nucleus of any future force which we may hope to create may be wiped out unless the Chinese attacks are brought to an early halt.

Meanwhile Chinese Communists with their hands red with the blood of our American boys, continue to be received with flowers in New York and hold up the proceedings at the United Nations while their stooges murder American boys. Bear in mind there is no declaration of war and none of the rights of war apply; yet we treat them more gently and more considerately than we did the Japanese civilians at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

How long does it seem possible that this situation can continue, while we here in the safe security of Washington or the nations of Europe deliberate as to whether or not it may be morally wise?

Our boys who lie under white crosses in Korea are not particularly concerned with the high moral consideration that agitate those who protect their murderers.

This situation is almost reminiscent of the debates which went on when gunpowder was discovered, the debates occurring in the days of chivalry as to whether it was wise and proper protocol to use a gun.

Mr. President, the atom bomb has been given to America by a divine providence and that ended the Second World War. As the Senator from Vermont

knows, Dr. Karl Compton, whose opinion I am sure he will respect, formerly president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and one of the great scientists of this country, has indicated grave doubts as to whether Russia now has the atom bomb. However, we must believe that the Russians have it—for the purpose of creating fear—fear of the Chinese, fear of the Russians, fear of the atom bomb, fear of everything. The one thing they seem to be generating in this country is that Americans in this day and generation must be afraid. I think General MacArthur has spoken a profound and pertinent truth when he said that the only thing the Orient recognizes is firmness and consistency. That is the only thing they respect, rather than the pusillanimous words we heard from our Secretary of State the other evening, words that aroused the entire country with apprehension and concern not only because of the literary essay on the six points we might adopt but also because of the weakness in delivery which caused consternation in the hearts of millions of Americans, as our mail abundantly reveals.

This is why I hope the Senator from Vermont may give further consideration to this matter, and not be willing to tie the hands of America, or of our President, or paralyze America in this period of crisis. I understood the President in his statement yesterday to say that since the responsibility for using the atom bomb had been entrusted by the Congress to his care, he—and by implication no one else—would exercise that responsibility. How can the President abdicate the responsibility that is so obviously his?

If the day has arrived when American boys must die while the United Nations debate as to whether we should use the atom bomb, I think it is a sorry day in American history; and I think the United Nations may be pronouncing their own doom if this travesty continues very much longer to prevail.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Maine in his feeling of distress over the plight in which the men we have in Korea find themselves; but I am also concerned about the next 100,000, and the next 100,000, and the next 100,000, and the next 100,000, and the next 100,000, and the next 100,000. I am concerned about them. I suggest to the Senator from Maine that he look a little further ahead than merely to the initial advantage possibly to be gained by the dropping of the atomic bomb on one very small section of the teeming millions of China.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator from Vermont have more confidence in the judgment of General MacArthur on that score than in that of those who are much farther removed from the scene of conflict? That has been my only suggestion.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes; that was the suggestion. It was my point of view that there should go along with that the question as to the ultimate results, aside from immediate military results which

General MacArthur is well qualified to decide. However, the question is one of much greater range and greater importance than immediate military results.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have just had the pleasure and privilege of conferring with the majority leader. I understand that if the situation works out according to the satisfaction of the majority and the minority, on Monday we shall vote on the rent-control joint resolution; in fact, I have been advised to that effect.

Of course, Mr. President, we are somewhat disturbed about the situation in connection with the rent-control joint resolution, because I was advised by the clerk of the committee and by others that the Printing Office would not have the printed hearings ready until Monday. It is true that at the hearings we heard only Government witnesses, but the hearings covered quite some time.

Of course, a great deal of restricted information was placed in the record; and later much of that information had to be deleted by the Air Force, the Navy, and the Army. That restricted information showed in detail the growth of the various military installations in the United States during the first quarter of this fiscal year, as I recall. If that restricted information were printed it might be of some benefit to the enemy. Of course, the members of the committee immediately agreed to have such testimony deleted from the printed hearings, and all of it was deleted. That resulted in delay in the printing of the hearings. Therefore, the printed hearings will not be available here until Monday.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was there any division in the committee with respect to the joint resolution?

Mr. MAYBANK. The vote was 10 for, 2 against, with 1 member voting present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator anticipate that there will be long debate about the extension for 2 months?

Mr. MAYBANK. I cannot speak for other Senators, but I will say to my good friend the Senator from Wyoming that I anticipate there will be some debate, for the reason that when the last rent-control resolution was adopted it was distinctly understood that it would be the last extension. At that time we passed a joint resolution extending rent control for 6 months, and gave the local municipalities the right to continue it for 6 months more. I have before me figures as to what happened, though I do not intend to read them. About 800 municipalities voted to extend Federal rent control through June 30, 1951, while about 1,700 with populations of 1,000 or more, including some near the majority leader's city of Chicago, did not vote. Cincinnati did not vote, nor did Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not apparent to all concerned that conditions have been completely revolutionized from

what they were when the Rent Control Act was last extended?

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say to my good friend from Wyoming that there is no Member of the Senate to whom that is not apparent; but there are some 1,700 communities to whom it is not apparent, as evidenced by the fact that they have done nothing about it, which to me is certainly a clear indication.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it the opinion of the Senator that the joint resolution should pass?

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall of course support it, as I supported and voted for it in committee. At the time of the last extension of Federal rent-control I stated on the floor that it would be the last. As the Senator from Wyoming recalls, there was in existence at that time practically no other control bill. Since that time, and in September of this year, we passed a control bill giving the President broad power over wages, prices, and materials, and other powers of stabilization.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What I am trying to determine by these questions, of course, is whether there is any likelihood that there will be protracted debate upon the rent-control joint resolution. It seems to me that it should pass almost without discussion.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, I am hopeful that the Senator is correct in his opinion, because I am in charge of the joint resolution, thanks to the majority party and the kindnesses which have been shown me by that party.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What majority party?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Democratic Party. What party would the Senator imagine? [Laughter].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not altogether certain, from what has been transpiring upon the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not know about that. The Democratic Party is the States' rights party of America. We are for States' rights, not Territorial rights.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That, of course, is one reason why I am advocating the statehood bill now being debated.

Mr. MAYBANK. I trust the Senator from Wyoming will go along with us on certain of our States' rights measures. I say that facetiously.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me ask another question. Am I correct in understanding that the Senator is not going to bring up the joint resolution until Monday?

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not intend to ask that it be considered before Monday. I conferred this morning with the majority leader. He thought we might take it up Monday, depending upon our progress on other matters. He gave me no assurance. I can only say to the Senator that the hearings will not be available in printed form until Monday, by reason of a delay in getting the hearings printed because of the elimination from the hearings of certain restricted information.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from South Carolina have any idea that we can clear the way for a consideration of the rent-control resolution by voting today to take up the statehood bill? If

we should take up the statehood bill, I, of course, would be the first to ask that it be temporarily laid aside in order to pass the rent-control measure.

Mr. MAYBANK. I could not answer that question. As the Senator knows, there was objection yesterday to considering the railroad labor bill, because of the likelihood that an FEPC amendment would be offered to it. There was also objection to voting Monday on the motion to take up the Alaska statehood bill.

All I have with me now is the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency, approved by a vote of 10 to 2, reporting a joint resolution which would extend rent control for 2 months. The subject may be studied further, in view of the tragedies which, as the Senator has said, have befallen the American people since the passage of the last rent-control bill. I refer particularly to the tragedies which have befallen our soldiers, sailors, and marines in Korea.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that we ought to pass the joint resolution without delay. We ought to pass appropriation bills without delay. We ought to pass without delay every single bill which Senators may present with respect to national defense. That includes statehood bills, which, in my judgment, are at this time fundamental to the national defense.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to say that not once have I voted against a national defense measure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I realize that.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Wyoming has joined with me, as has the Senator from Nebraska, on legislation regarding stockpiling, atomic energy, and everything else connected with national defense. So long as I remain in the Senate I shall vote for everything that may be in the interest of the national defense.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know the Senator will.

Mr. MAYBANK. But I disagree with the Senator about the relationship of the Alaska statehood bill to national defense. I do not go along with him on that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall demonstrate the relationship.

Mr. MAYBANK. There is a difference of opinion between us on that one matter, but on all other matters we join hands.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. With respect to the rent-control measure, so far as the majority is concerned, particularly Senators who are vitally interested in it, we are ready to consider it at any time. I think we might take it up and pass it this afternoon.

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that the only difficulty is that the hearings have not yet been printed. So far as I know, it would be rather unprecedented if the Senate felt that we should take up the bill without the report and the hearings.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator from Wyoming. I do not think there is going to be very much trouble on the question of a 60-day extension.

Mr. MAYBANK. I hope there will not be.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret that it is not 90 days. I cannot anticipate what the new Congress will do, but I feel sure that next year we shall have not only rent control but a number of other controls.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from Illinois. If the House passes a 90-day extension and we pass a 60-day extension, the difference can be adjusted in conference and probably a satisfactory agreement can be reached. In the meantime, we are going to have additional controls. The reason I suggested taking up the rent-control joint resolution on Monday was that some of the testimony shows the need for the controls. I may say to the majority leader that the Banking and Currency Committee plans to meet on Monday at 10:30 in an open hearing, of which notice has been given, to hear the testimony of Mr. Alan Valentine, the Economic Stabilization Administrator. We are planning to devote all of Monday to that testimony. He will be the principal witness. On Tuesday we are going to meet with Michael DiSalle, who has been nominated to be Director of Price Stabilization. He is the mayor of Toledo. This indicates that we have not been deliberately trying to limit the time needed for proper consideration of the matter. But it is not for me, as one of 96 Senators, to rise and say that there will be no debate on the question. We have had excellent cooperation, I may say, from both Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I sincerely hope that the report will be ready by Monday, in order that we may be able to take up the joint resolution at that time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Illinois. What I am about to do is to read the report now, so that it will be in the RECORD where Senators may read it on Saturday. If there are any delays in the printing of the report by Monday, Senators will at least have today's RECORD and will be able to read the report. I intend to read it now.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that very much. Certainly we ought to be able to pass the rent control resolution on Monday without any delay.

Mr. MAYBANK. I hope we shall.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I merely wish to ask the majority leader whether I am correct in understanding that on Monday he will move to make the rent control resolution the order of business?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. At 12 o'clock?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I shall read the report so that it may be printed in the RECORD and so that Senators may have an opportunity to study it over the week end. On Monday Senators

will not be able to say, "We just arrived today, and the report has come in only today; we have not had an opportunity to study it." I am not accusing any Senator of having shown that disposition heretofore, but I shall read the report to prevent that situation from arising.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator can put it in the RECORD by unanimous consent. I am sure that no Senator will object.

Mr. MAYBANK. No; I prefer to read it.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a statement?

Mr. MAYBANK. I will yield for a brief statement, provided I do not thereby lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from South Carolina may yield to the Senator from Connecticut without prejudicing his right to the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may I ask the majority leader another question that I have been requested to ask?

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for that purpose, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from South Carolina yields to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the intention of the majority leader to take up any other bills of any kind this afternoon? I refer to bills that may be on the calendar. If so, what bills?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I do not believe it would be advisable to take up any other bills. There are two or three bills which are not considered important by the administration, but which are considered important by certain Senators. I am sure we can pass those without much trouble. I do not have the numbers of those bills, but I will insert them in the RECORD before I leave today, in order that Senators may know what they may anticipate following disposition of the rent-control bill. It must be apparent to all that as the result of the maneuvering of our friends who are opposed to that measure, we are not going to get a vote upon the Alaska statehood bill. Consequently, it seems to me that it would be rather futile and useless to go along listening to speeches when we may be able to transact some other business with respect to certain bills now on the calendar. Of course, the moment any measures in connection with the Korean situation, in which the White House and the administration are vitally concerned, come from the White House or from the committees, we shall immediately take them up. That includes appropriations, aid to Yugoslavia, aid to Korea, and taxes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is the Senator's intention to place in the RECORD this afternoon the numbers of the bills he will ask to have considered next week, and can we be sure that he will not ask that they be called up this afternoon?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator can be assured of that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely wish to say to the Senator from Illinois and to other Senators that I have not sacrificed the hope that there may yet be unanimous consent to vote upon the motion of the majority leader to make the statehood bill the unfinished business of the Senate. It will be my purpose, therefore, later in the day, after negotiations which are now in progress have developed a little further, to make another request for unanimous consent to vote before the middle of next week on the motion which is now pending. I am not disposed to give way upon the importance of the statehood bills. I wished to advise the Senator from Illinois and other Senators that negotiations are in progress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, first, if I may be permitted to interrupt, I should like to concur in what the Senator from Wyoming has stated with respect to the importance of the Alaska statehood bill. The Senator from Illinois is a realist. He can see clouds on the horizon. I do not propose in this short session to continue to debate the Alaska statehood bill when other measures of importance require consideration. Of course, I should like to have my good friends from the South agree on a date on which we could vote on the motion to consider the Alaska statehood bill, as well as on a date on which we could vote on the merits of the bill. Until that can be done, I do not believe it would be the better part of wisdom to debate endlessly the Alaska statehood bill when other measures of importance await consideration. I do not believe the Senate desires to follow such a course. I hope the Senator from Wyoming will be persuasive enough to convince the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] in that respect, although the Senator from Mississippi has made very vociferous objection. I hope he will repent and give the Senator from Wyoming and other Senators interested in the statehood bill an opportunity to proceed with the statehood bill. However, he looks as determined today as he did yesterday when he made his objection. I believe he looks even more determined today. I hope I am wrong in my analysis of the Senator's appearance today, but I do not think I am wrong in that respect.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? The Senator from South Carolina yielded to me about 10 minutes ago. I should like to make a short statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall be glad to yield to any Senator whom the Chair recognizes provided I do not lose the floor. I do not wish to stand on my feet during this colloquy, and I shall like

to give Senators an opportunity to make short statements. Therefore, I shall be very glad to yield to any Senator whom the Chair recognizes, provided I do not lose the floor by so yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina that he may yield to Senators without his losing the floor? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a moment so that I may make a statement in reply to the question addressed to me by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Mississippi will not think I am unreasonable, but I cannot yield any further. I asked the Senator from South Carolina to yield to me to make a short statement. I have been waiting 10 minutes to make it. I have an engagement which I must keep. My statement will take only a minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

POSSESSION OF THE ATOM BOMB BY THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to say that twice within the past few days the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has quoted Prof. Karl Compton's belief that the Soviet Union does not possess the atomic bomb. Similar beliefs have been expressed by other people during the past year. They would like to believe what Dr. Compton believes. I agree it is a very comforting thought. However, I think it should be stated for the RECORD that the evidence available to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which evidence has been available to the committee for the past year, since September 23, indicates that the Soviets did explode an atomic weapon and that they are today in the business of manufacturing. I think that fact should be stated for the RECORD. I do not believe it is either wise or judicious for the Senator from Maine to send forth such information, when all the evidence in the hands of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy indicates directly to the contrary. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for one more question on procedure?

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It may be unnecessary to ask the question. However, the minority would appreciate the assurance that if the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] asks for a unanimous-consent agreement on the motion to consider the Alaska statehood bill, even though it is not necessary to have a quorum call, he will nevertheless ask for a quorum call before he makes his request for unanimous consent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be happy to do so if I am not barred. I therefore ask for preliminary unanimous consent that whenever it may be possible

to offer such a request for unanimous consent to vote at a time certain upon the motion of the majority leader to consider the statehood bill a quorum call may be had without respect to whether any business has been transacted since the previous quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall not object, but if I understand the rules of the Senate, before a unanimous-consent request can be submitted to the Senate, a quorum call must be had.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I did not so understand the rule on a motion to consider a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that unless some business has been transacted, a quorum call is not mandatory. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I believe we have before us a measure on which debate has been inadequate. I shall object, therefore, when a unanimous-consent request is made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Wyoming asks the Senator from Mississippi if he does not think adequate debate could be obtained on the floor of the Senate after the motion to consider the bill had been agreed to?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, if I thought so, I would not object. I do not think we have had adequate debate. I shall certainly make objection to any such unanimous-consent request.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Mississippi is now notifying the Senate and all concerned that both upon the motion to consider and upon the merits of the bill the Senator will object to any unanimous-consent request.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Mississippi is not notifying anyone on anything. He is simply replying to the question addressed to him by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD at this point a telegram from the National Headquarters of the Marine Corps League, which I received, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is dated November 28, and reads:

BATON ROUGE, LA., November 28, 1950
Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

"Whereas the Marine Corps has, since the founding of the Republic, been in the vanguard of the Nation's struggle for the defense and extension of the principles of democracy; and

"Whereas the world today is in a critical struggle in the continuing conflict between freedom and tyranny and the United States as the leader of the forces of freedom has

an obligation to set the most effective example of popular self-government to the peoples of the world; and

"Whereas the extension of the frontiers of our democracy can be most strikingly extended by the immediate admission of the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union of States; and

"Whereas the Senate of the United States now has before it for consideration bills for the admission of Alaska and Hawaii which have been enacted by the House of Representatives and which have received the overwhelming endorsement of the appropriate committee of the Senate; and

"Whereas the peoples of these Territories have voted for statehood and the opinion of the peoples of these Territories have voted for statehood and the opinion of the people of the Nation is preponderantly in favor of immediate admission of Alaska and Hawaii; and

"Whereas it has been demonstrated and proved that these Territories have met and surpassed all constitutional and reasonable qualifications for admission; and

"Whereas these Territories have long been valued possessions of these United States, and the people thereof in times of both peace and war have demonstrated their loyalty, their spirit of self-sacrifice, their trustworthiness, and their abilities to be good citizens; and

"Whereas the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii are important outposts in the preservation of world peace and in the defense of the shores of the continental limits of these United States, and their admittance to statehood will strengthen the position of these Territories in the defense of our shores and in the maintenance of world peace; Be it therefore

"Resolved, That the national legislative officer recommend to the Congress of the United States to enact laws to the effect that the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii be granted statehood."

Resolution adopted at Marine Corps League National Convention in Washington, D. C., September 6, 1950.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS, MARINE CORPS LEAGUE, OLD STATE CAPITOL, BATON ROUGE, LA.

By BETTY F. CONEY.

I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as I was about to say a while ago, when, of course, I yielded to first one Senator and then another who had important observations to make, I did not have the opportunity fully to explain that the rent-control joint resolution is to me rather embarrassing, because last year when we brought the rent-control resolution before the Senate I stated that that would be the last one. I said that, Mr. President, and it is in the RECORD, in connection with the measure then passed in which certain powers of extension were provided, advantage of which was taken by some communities and not by others.

The reason why I have changed my position is that a dreadful war has come upon our people since that statement of mine, and in the meantime the President has appointed officials to take charge of types of control other than rent control. It is my judgment that we are going to be in a more and more controlled economy as time goes on. So I had to alter my position, because of the misfortunes of our soldiers, our sailors, and our marines, and because of the tragedy

of the Korean situation which arose last summer.

Mr. President, I again desire to say that while I was embarrassed, my country and its people always come first. It was for that reason that I introduced the joint resolution calling for a 60-day extension, so that the New Congress could look over the situation and write whatever law Congress deemed to be necessary to cover Federal control of rents after the first of March.

The impact of the war economy, and of the orders to be issued by those in charge, as appears in the testimony, for instance, of Chairman Symington, will not be reached, probably, until April of next year. As we continue approaching that time, with the inflationary trend, with the scarcity of some goods, and like conditions, it is going to be essential to place controls on strategic materials, and if necessary to enact stronger laws against hoarding and profiteering.

Mr. President, I understand that the President of the United States today asked the Committee on Appropriations, for an additional \$16,800,000,000, plus over a billion dollars for atomic energy development, making about \$18,000,000,000 the President has asked for since he called for the deficiency appropriations last September and October.

Mr. President, I am now going to take the liberty of reading the report of the committee on Senate Joint Resolution 207:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the joint resolution do pass.

Mr. President, the vote was 10 for the 60-day extension, 2 opposed, and 1 member voted "present."

The report continues:

On June 23, 1950, the President approved Public Law 574, the Housing and Rent Act of 1950. In general this was a decontrol act looking toward the complete lifting of Federal rent controls by December 31, 1950. * * *

At that time, in June, that was what I hoped would be done, and that is why I said I did not expect another rent-control-extension measure. I think every Senator knows, yes, every American knows, that since June 23, 1950, there have been many changes in the economy of this country, as well as tragic changes involving war.

The report continues:

In general this was a decontrol act looking toward the complete lifting of Federal rent controls by December 31, 1950, except in those areas where affirmative action should be taken by local governing bodies to extend such controls through June 30, 1951. Two days later—

Just think of it, just 2 days later—

on June 25, 1950, North Korean aggression against the Republic of Korea commenced with a southward crossing of the thirty-eighth parallel.

We passed the bill which became Public Law 574, it went to conference, the President signed it on June 23, 1950, and

on June 25 the North Koreans advanced. That is another reason why I wish to make the Record perfectly clear as to why I introduced the measure for a 60-day extension. It is because we are living in a different world in December 1950 from that which existed in May and June 1950 when we looked forward to a peacetime economy and passed Public Law 574 in order to encourage those interested in building to erect more houses.

I continue reading from the report:

Subsequent events have led to a drastic change in conditions which existed at the time the Housing and Rent Act of 1950 was framed and adopted. The Nation entered upon a program to bolster the national security, the full impact of which on the economy will probably not be felt until next spring.

Mr. President, I use the term "next spring," because those who are supposed to be familiar with conditions and know the plans of the Government realize that the impact has not affected our people as yet. It has affected them somewhat, but not to the extent it will affect them by spring of next year, through defense preparations and controls other than rent controls.

The report continues:

The shifting about of people in defense work and in the Armed Forces may be expected to increase as the preparedness program is stepped up. Coupled with a decrease in the recently high rate of construction of civilian housing, this situation has caused and will increasingly cause an inadequacy in the supply of housing to meet the demand in certain areas.

Your committee is of the opinion that there is not sufficient time in the remaining few weeks before the convening of the Eighty-second Congress to hold public hearings and discuss adequately the need for framing rent-control legislation properly designed to meet the new conditions growing out of the Korean developments.

I agree with what the majority leader said, that probably we will pass another rent-control bill next year. What sort of bill we will have to pass I do not know. What sort of bill the Senate and the House will determine upon I do not know. That is not up to me. But, as I see the situation, with the curtailment of the building of houses, with more strategic materials being controlled, a bill will have to be passed, not to control or decontrol rents in places like Miami Beach, Tucson, Ariz., or other places if they are used only as pleasure resorts, but in places to which people are being shifted due to the defense program. The Army says they will reach a peak of 2,700,000 troops, and the families of those troops must be housed properly.

The report continues:

That is a problem which will undoubtedly demand the early attention of the Eighty-second Congress. After reviewing the facts presented to it by Chairman W. Stuart Symington, of the National Security Resources Board; Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Eugene Zuckert, testifying on behalf of the Secretary of Defense; and Housing Expediter Tighe E. Woods, your committee was reluctant to let Federal rent controls lapse completely on December 31, 1950, except in those areas where local action is taken to continue controls through June 30, 1951. Several communities have expressed the idea that the rent-control problems con-

fronting the country are national in scope and require Federal action, not merely a patchwork quilt of controls determined by the local action of Government bodies. Those who would be immediately affected by the increased rents—the military and the defense workers—would in most cases have no voice on the local governing body, and thus, naturally, look to the Federal Government to maintain reasonable rentals.

I again call attention to the fact that I believe it to be the duty of the Federal Government, when we shift them, to give some protection to the military and to defense workers, although I do not believe it is the duty of the Federal Government to control rents alone. Many things will have to be controlled. The Government will have to prevent hoarding, and while we are in process of doing all that, the extension of the rent-control legislation is the better part of wisdom.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I have curiosity about one very serious matter which I think the Senator from South Carolina can satisfy. As a result of the passage of the act to which the Senator has just referred, the State of New York got out from under Federal rent controls—passed, approved, and put into effect the operation of its own State system of controls. I only know from what little I have read on that question that New York State is pretty well in agreement that they would ever so much rather, if rent controls be required, have the rents controlled and operated and supervised under State authority than Federal authority.

Mr. MAYBANK. I believe that is the way the matter should be handled; but the other States have not done it. I take my hat off to New York for doing it, as well as to Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and the other cities, such as Chicago, where those favoring such action at least went to the city councils and stood up and voted and were counted.

Mr. CAIN. I ask the question because I was inclined to infer from what the Senator from South Carolina has recently said that in the next session of the Congress it is likely that a Federal rent-control law will be passed which will bring New York State within the jurisdiction of that act, and if there is any such likelihood, I think now is the time to suggest to New York State that what they have but so recently done and agreed upon is likely to be undone in the very near future.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, of course I would not be one to make any suggestion to New York State. I do not want someone from New York to suggest anything for South Carolina. I can say to the Senator from Washington that the matter has been under study by Governor Dewey, and distinguished representatives from New York, including the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], who has been associated with Governor Dewey, and is a most competent and able member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. He should be able to explain the matter to our committee, and I certainly rely upon his judgment.

Mr. CAIN. The general subject of rent controls is a difficult one.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is very difficult, and I do not know what the Congress is going to do. The Senator does not know what is going to happen. Let us hope and pray with all our hearts that the Russian and the Chinese situations will become better. But if they become worse, I do not know what kind of a law we will have. I think we will need some law which will affect the soldiers and sailors and marines and the defense workers who will be shifted from one community to another. Perhaps 7,000,000 persons are going to be moved.

Mr. CAIN. All I know is that our country, to which we are all deeply devoted, is in quite a sad dilemma. Therefore, if it be true, and the hearings held by the Senator's committee should so determine, that New York State has effectively and fairly and adequately administered rent controls within the jurisdiction of that State, I should like to think that the committee would encourage other States to do likewise in order that Uncle Sam would be as little burdened as possible.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the Senator from Washington that if it were found that the situation with respect to the State of New York was satisfactory, and that the law was functioning well, I would be the first person to join in asking other States to do the same thing, if at the same time in some way exemptions could be granted, such as the exemptions with respect to New York and Chicago in the case of hotels. The Senator remembers those exemptions.

Mr. CAIN. Yes, indeed I do.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would be in favor of such a program, if it could be worked out. I would not be in favor of the Federal Government taking over any controls except in the interest of national defense.

Mr. CAIN. Even in the interest or name of the national defense, we ought to believe that every municipality and every State should first do all it could, before requiring any assistance either in the field or controlling rents or any other enterprise and, before seeking relief or assistance or leadership from the Federal Government.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am in thorough accord with the Senator that States ought to do what they can to help meet problems such as this.

Mr. CAIN. I know the Senator is, and I know he will not take exception to my raising one or two questions.

Mr. MAYBANK. No. The New York law has apparently been working satisfactorily. When the committee holds hearings on the proposed new law I shall rely on the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], as well as on the Senator from Washington, who was formerly a member of the committee. If a satisfactory agreement can be reached to exempt New York City and other cities and still accomplish the purposes of the legislation, I shall be glad to vote for it. As the Senator from Washington knows, in 1949, when we exempted even the largest cities, Chicago and New York, with respect to hotels for transients, I voted for that exemption.

Mr. CAIN. Yes. I think it is a fair thing to say to the Senator from South Carolina, particularly in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that the junior Senator from Washington expects to oppose the joint resolution to extend the present law for a period of 60 days, and I shall oppose it for more than one reason. But one reason why I shall oppose it, which is not to say that I shall endeavor unduly to take the time of the Senate, is that in my view, if there be a Federal rent-control law in the future coming out of the war situation and full mobilization, it will obviously bear no similarity to the prevailing law.

Mr. MAYBANK. In my opinion the Senator is correct.

Mr. CAIN. It would then seem to me to be the wise thing to do to let the law of the land take its own course. The prevailing rent law is to expire on the 31st day of December 1950. The new Congress can then begin all over again to deal with the subject.

We are going to need a new piece of machinery. Certainly, in my judgment, we will require a new set of managers. It is to some extent, indeed, largely for that reason, that I should think the present law ought to expire, in order that we may completely clear the decks and give to the new Congress a complete freedom of action.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am not going to argue that point. Considerable argument could take place on both sides of the question. I will say, however, that shortly after the Korean incident began last summer, and when the Defense Production Act was under consideration, there was considerable agitation, and some requests made, for the inclusion in it of rent control. I said at that time that we then had in effect the present rent-control law, and that I did not think a new provision with respect to rent control belonged in the Defense Production Act. I do not know whether that question was voted on in committee. It was discussed, however, at quite some length, and I opposed the proposal to include rent control in the Defense Production Act.

Mr. CAIN. I wanted to tell the Senator from South Carolina where the Senator from Washington stands, and to be so bold as to suggest one or two items I wanted to draw to the Senator's attention.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the boldness of the Senator from Washington. While we do not always agree, I have only the highest regard and respect for the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I appreciate the Senator's comment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I continue to read from the report of the committee:

Your committee received testimony from the Housing Expediter that as of November 27, 1950, there were 1,703 incorporated places with a 1950 population of 1,000 or more which had not taken affirmative action to continue rent controls beyond the end of this year. Yet, in many of the same areas it has been and will continue to be necessary to house many more people due to an increase in defense production or activation of military establishments after December 31, 1950. However, plans for future actions

such as these which cause an impact on local rental situations may well be presently unknown to the local governing bodies in those areas, possibly for security reasons.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask another question?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. CAIN. I listened to the Senator's reading of the last sentence, from which I understood that more than 1,000 communities have not by affirmative action said they wanted the Federal rent-control law continued from December 31 of this year to June 30 of next year.

Mr. MAYBANK. Positive action has not been taken in 1,703 communities having a population of 1,000 and over.

Mr. CAIN. I understand. The committee report says that in some of these communities there will be an added population as the result of incoming war workers.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes. Mr. Zuckert made a statement respecting that situation which he asked be eliminated from the Record for security reasons. But I mention one instance which has appeared in the newspapers. It deals with Camp Leonard Wood in Missouri. A great number of persons were moved there. They have asked for the reimposition of rent control there.

Mr. CAIN. We start out with over a thousand communities. By way of argument I will certainly assume that if our war situation becomes more complex and complicated, some among those communities will substantially increase in population.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have seen figures on that point, and I will say the Senator is correct.

Mr. CAIN. But is not the reverse also true, that among those thousand-odd communities there will be of necessity a good many communities whose population will decrease?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is true. In such cases the city councils could vote to remove rent control. I agree with the Senator's statement that in many places the population will increase, and in others will decrease.

Mr. CAIN. I am talking about a possible new law, and my hope is that the committee itself would take every conceivable step to see that controls were not imposed upon American communities where there was no need for such controls, and where it was a proven, established fact, that population had decreased.

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say I am always prayerful that the present situation will change. But if it does not, I will say to the Senator from Washington that we will hold extensive hearings, and give both proponents and opponents of the proposed new rent measure an opportunity to be heard. The Senator remembers that last year I worked on the problem day and night, and the Senator from Washington joined in that work.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington had a very happy time in doing so.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator was a member of the committee last year when we rewrote the bill many times.

Mr. CAIN. And as a member of the Senator's committee I was partly critical of what was then the present rent law of the land, because it unnecessarily continued to impose controls on American cities when those wartime controls had long since outlived their usefulness.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct; and I voted in favor of permitting communities who wished to do so to get out from under the law.

Mr. CAIN. That, I think, was one of the fairest and most reasonable and most intelligent steps that was ever taken with reference to this subject.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, the city councils of cities in the State of Washington, in the State of Utah, in the State of California, in the State of South Carolina, and in all other States, know more about their own problems than do persons who are in Washington.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from South Carolina and I are in complete agreement on that point. One thing I have never been able to understand is how it could possibly be construed that the Federal Government in Washington, D. C., could be more highly competent or qualified to determine the need, or lack of need, for rent controls, as, for example, in Seattle, in the State of Washington, than are those responsible for the management of that city or its city council. Whatever happens, I hope we may give every ounce of jurisdiction and responsibility possible to the local city councils and to the State establishments.

Mr. MAYBANK. The mayors of the cities of a State and the Governor of the State should know more about conditions in that State than Members of the United States Senate. That is the way I look at it.

Mr. CAIN. As one who shares a background comparable to that of the Senator from South Carolina, I have felt, and often said to many of those who used to be my colleagues and continue to be my friends, that "the bulk of the responsibility for a continuing Federal rent-control law lies upon your heads because of your unwillingness in many instances to acknowledge and to wish to take over your responsibility for running the affairs of your community." I can only wish that all the mayors of today share that view, as apparently some do not.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am sorry some of them do not. But many of them are going to be present here on Monday and Tuesday. I know the former mayor of Seattle is going to be here.

I read further from the report of the committee:

Without a clear knowledge of these conditions, it is difficult for local governing bodies to act wisely in the national interest. National problems require national action. Indeed the Housing Expediter testified that surveys revealed many employers are already experiencing difficulty in recruiting and retaining immigrant workers due to the inability of new workers to find housing. He further stated that already in military areas, commanding officers are expressing serious concern over the difficulties experienced by military personnel under their command in obtaining suitable housing.

Today about 7,500,000 rental-housing units remain under Federal rent controls; 3,430,-

000 of these will stay under Federal rent controls through June 30, 1951, by virtue of the action of local governing bodies to date. This leaves about 4,000,000 units from which Federal rent controls will be removed on December 31, 1950, in the absence of affirmative action by the governing body of the local government having jurisdiction in the area where the units are located. It is primarily these approximately 4,000,000 units which will be affected by this joint resolution. The fact that these governing bodies have not seen fit to remove the units from Federal rent controls indicates either a tight situation in the rental market in those areas, or at best a condition where housing supply was just beginning to meet demand in the absence of the new national emergency caused by the Korean developments.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. With reference to the last sentence the Senator from South Carolina has just read, I should like to say that I do not hold it to be entirely valid, for the reason that during the last 2 months I have had an opportunity to discuss the rent-control situation with the mayors and councilmen of a number of American cities. I have often said to them, "Why have you not taken positive, affirmative action to remove your city from Federal rent-control jurisdiction?"

In many instances they have replied, "Why should we? The question is controversial; it is difficult. Why should we not rely on the law of the land which tells us that in several short months' time we will automatically be removed from rent control?" They have said, "Why should we look for a fight which can be easily—or expediently or conveniently, if you will—"avoided by letting the law take its own course, when the law reads that on December 31 there are to be no more controls, unless they are retained by affirmative action of the local community."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator has said, and I think some of the communities have dodged the issue.

Yet we are told that, because of war conditions, it will be February before adequate findings can be made regarding new rent-control legislation. Meanwhile, something must be done to provide for the families of sailors and soldiers who are being sent overseas, some of them never to return.

Mr. President, a moment ago I referred to the approximately 4,000,000 units which will be affected by this joint resolution. The report continues:

If those units were now thrown into an uncontrolled market, in view of the growing impact of the national preparedness program, excessive increases in rent would be entirely likely. Such increases followed by increased wages to enable payment of the rents would increase the cost of defense preparations and cause inflationary pressures on the national economy. As the President said in his November 27, 1950, letter to the chairman of your committee in suggesting

an extension of the automatic decontrol date beyond December 31, 1950: "Unless this extension is made, many communities may be decontrolled by the operation of the present law before they, or the Congress, have been able to examine the problems confronting them, and with results that may be damaging to the national defense."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter the President wrote to me as chairman of the committee be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, November 27, 1950.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, the Housing and Rent Act of 1950 will eliminate rent control in all incorporated cities, towns, and villages after December 31, 1950, unless they have taken affirmative action by that date to continue such control. I strongly recommend that the Congress extend that date to March 31, 1951. Such an extension would not interfere with the authority local communities now have to decontrol rents when in their judgment it seems proper.

The present rent control law was enacted before the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. It was passed to provide for the orderly transition to a free rental market in a peacetime economy. There has been a marked change in the situation since the law was passed. The outbreak of aggression during recent months has compelled us to move rapidly to increase our military strength. We are expanding our Army, Navy, and Air Force. We are stepping up our production of defense items and increasing our industrial capacity. To carry out this program successfully and to safeguard our economy, it will be necessary to keep rents in vital defense areas from rising to unreasonable levels.

Therefore, we must consider anew the whole problem of rent control in relation to the pressures now being created by the defense program. We must look into the situation around reactivated military camps and installations so that servicemen and their families can be given necessary protection against rent gouging. We must prevent high rents from interfering with the recruiting of defense workers and their movement to defense jobs. We must consider the relation of rent control to the price and wage aspects of our stabilization program.

I realize that there is insufficient time for the Congress to make a full investigation of these problems and consider a new rent control law during the present session. Moreover, during the next few months it should be possible to form a more accurate judgment concerning the effects of our expanded defense program on rents and housing needs. The extension of the automatic decontrol date to March 31, 1951, will permit the Eighty-second Congress to give full consideration to the effects of our defense program and make whatever changes in the law may be necessary. Unless this extension is made, many communities may be decontrolled by the operation of the present law before they, or the Congress, have been able to examine the problems confronting them, and with results that may be damaging to the national defense.

I will appreciate it if you will take this matter up with your committee with a view to obtaining favorable action upon such an extension.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and
Currency, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the report continues:

This joint resolution would extend this automatic decontrol date through February 1951, from December 31, 1950. This action would not result in an across-the-board freeze of rents at the December 31, 1950, level, for the rental adjustment provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended would remain fully operative. The Housing Expediter testified that these adjustments had been substantial in number. In the first 4 months of the current fiscal year, July through October, rent increases were authorized for 418,133 rental units. This almost doubled the number for the previous 4 months, when increases were authorized for 239,236 units.

Nor would extension of the automatic decontrol date remove the authority of incorporated cities, towns, or villages or unincorporated areas of counties to remove their areas from Federal rent controls by action of their local governing bodies up to and including February 28, 1951.

Mr. President, I wish to make that point very plain, because unfortunately some Senators who have asked me about this measure have naturally not quite understood what was recommended by the committee, because they are not on the committee and we did not hold open hearings.

Our recommendation is merely to extend the present law for 60 days, so that the new Congress can make a study of the situation after the impact of war has come upon us. If the law is extended by means of this joint resolution, any town in Arkansas, Maine, California, or elsewhere in the United States which wishes to take local action to be relieved of rent control may do so; the local option will still remain. I wish to assure all Senators, particularly those who believe in States' rights, of that point.

Nor would such an extension of the automatic decontrol date authorize the Housing Expediter to bring under Federal rent control any area already or hereafter removed from the scope of Federal rent control by action of its governing body or by the legislature of the State in which it is located. Nor would such an extension empower the Housing Expediter to invoke Federal rent controls over housing accommodations whose maximum rents have been or are hereafter removed as the result of approval by the Emergency Court of Appeals of a recommendation of a local advisory board or as the result of approval by that court of a decision by the Housing Expediter to decontrol such rents.

In brief, the joint resolution is in effect merely a stop-gap measure pending the convening of the Eighty-second Congress in January. It is the present intention of your committee in the early days of that Congress to review the entire problem of Federal rent control in relation to the other measures for stabilization of the national economy, such as price and wage controls.

Under the Housing and Rent Act of 1950, all Federal rent controls would expire on December 31, 1950, except under two conditions. They would end on June 30, 1951, in any incorporated city, town, or village which (while under Federal rent controls and before December 31, 1950) declares by resolution of its governing body adopted for that purpose, or by popular referendum, in accordance with local law, that a shortage of rental housing exists requiring the continuance of rent control in that city, town, or village. Federal rent controls would likewise end on June 30, 1951, in any unincorporated locality in a defense-rental area in

which one or more incorporated cities, towns, or villages constituting the major portion of that defense-rental area have made an appropriate declaration of the need for the continuance of rent control in the respective city, town, or village. For the reasons set forth herein, your committee recommends the prompt enactment of this joint resolution in order to extend from December 31, 1950, to February 28, 1951, the date for automatic decontrol of controlled housing accommodations in those communities which under existing law take no affirmative action to preserve Federal rent controls through June 30, 1951.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the joint resolution, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets):

Public Law 574, Eighty-first Congress, section 4

Section 204 (f) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) (1) The provisions of this title, except section 204 (a), shall cease to be in effect at the close of [December 31, 1950] February 28, 1951, except that they shall cease to be in effect at the close of June 30, 1951.

"(A) in any incorporated city, town, or village which, at a time when maximum rents under this title are in effect therein, and prior to [December 31, 1950] February 28, 1951, declares (by resolution of its governing body adopted for that purpose, or by popular referendum, in accordance with local law) that a shortage of rental housing accommodations exists which requires the continuance of rent control in such city, town, or village; and

"(B) in any unincorporated locality in a defense-rental area in which one or more incorporated cities, towns, or villages constituting the major portion of the defense-rental area have made the declaration specified in subparagraph (A) at a time when maximum rents under this title were in effect in such unincorporated locality."

I desire to thank the Chair and the other Senators for their indulgence. I merely wanted to have this report read so that it might appear in today's RECORD. We expect to have the completed hearings, of course, on Monday.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say at this time. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Maybank
Anderson	Hill	Millikin
Benton	Hoey	Morse
Brewster	Holland	Murray
Bridges	Hunt	Neely
Butler	Ives	O'Connor
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capehart	Kefauver	Saltanostall
Carlson	Kerr	Schoepel
Chavez	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Clements	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Leahy	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Lehman	Stennis
Donnell	Long	Taylor
Dworshak	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Eaton	McClellan	Thye
Ellender	McFarland	Tobey
Flanders	McKellar	Tydings
Fulbright	McMahon	Watkins
George	Magnuson	Wherry
Gillette	Malone	Wiley
Gurney	Martin	Young
Hayden		

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to proceed to the consideration of H. R. 331, to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am ready for a vote; but, as a matter of precaution, and more or less as a matter of notice to the Members of the Senate, I wish to place in the RECORD a list of bills which we might be able to take up at almost any time in the event the Senate finds time in the short session, or in the event we should run out of something to consider before the important measures involving the war effort come before us.

The first is Calendar No. 2540, H. R. 483, to extend the time limit within which certain suits in admiralty may be brought against the United States.

Calendar No. 2578, H. R. 9313, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. AIKEN. Is that the Carolina-Virginia peanut bill?

Mr. LUCAS. No. H. R. 9313 deals with the disposal of surplus food commodities.

The next is Calendar No. 2265, H. R. 5967, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to clarify the status of freight forwarders and their relationship with motor common carriers.

Calendar No. 1777, H. R. 2734, to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopoly, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended.

Calendar No. 1811, H. R. 2365, for the relief of the city of Chester, Ill.

Mr. President, those are the five measures which I am now calling to the attention of the Senate. At any time when there is a lull, after a quorum call, I may ask the Senate to consider these measures.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator mentioned bills of major importance which may be brought up. Can he identify them?

Mr. LUCAS. I refer to the appropriation bill which will come before the Senate dealing with national defense and the war effort, the appropriation bill dealing with furnishing of food to Yugoslavia, and the one dealing with food for Korea. I also refer to the tax bill. There may be other measures of importance which will have to be brought up in the next few weeks.

I do not desire to overlook the fact that the bill to amend the Railway Labor Act, S. 3295, which the Senate considered for a while, and which was the unfinished business when the Senate reconvened, also may be taken up at any time.

MARCUS WHITMAN

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington wishes to speak for a brief period about the character, capacity, and characteristics of a great American who made his contribution to progress in history more than a century ago. It would be good to have

what in him was his strength, courage, and vision with us today in America, when we are so in need of guidance, inspiration, and perseverance.

Mr. President, Wednesday of this week, November 29, 1950, was a day of considerable importance in the State of Washington. November 29 was designated by Gov. Arthur B. Langlie as Marcus Whitman Day, and the occasion was properly and thoughtfully observed and recognized in each of Washington State's 39 counties.

It was on Tuesday of this week that I had been invited by telegram from some of those in authority within Washington State to address myself to the subject of Marcus Whitman. In response, I said that the situation then on the floor of the Senate did not permit discussion of any subject other than the pending business. They hoped I would be able to speak about Marcus Whitman at an early date, and it is my intention to do that now. I wish to tell a simple and magnificent story about a simple and magnificent American. I believe that Senators will agree that the precious time involved is well spent.

Because they lived and died more than a century ago it is reasonable to assume that some among us in the Senate and many living Americans have never previously heard of Marcus and Narcissa Whitman. In an address delivered in Spokane in June of this year, Dr. Chester C. Maxey, president of Whitman College, mentioned the Whitmans in the following beautiful and commemorative fashion:

There has been no other couple like the Whitmans in American history—no wooing more strange, no wedding more extraordinary, no marriage more proof against stress and storm, no union of purpose and effort more perfect, no failure more pathetic, no ending more terrible, and no immortality more sublime than theirs. Forces they did not control or understand brought their lives together in a noble enterprise that failed; forces they did not control or understand brought their lives to a dire and agonizing close. Yet so greatly did they live, so magnificently did they labor and serve, that forces they set in motion will forever enrich the civilization they helped to plant on the western slopes of the Continental Divide.

Mr. President, the 1949 session of the Washington State Legislature by almost unanimous votes in both the Senate and House passed a bill designating Dr. Marcus Whitman as the first official representative of the State in Statuary Hall, Washington, D. C.

By act of Congress, distinguished American citizens illustrious for their historic renown or distinguished civic or military service are eligible to be so commemorated.

In authorizing the placing of the statue of Marcus Whitman in Statuary Hall, the legislature recognized the "historic renown" that has come to be associated with the story of Marcus Whitman in the more than 100 years since the tragic Whitman massacre at Waiilatpu, "the place of rye grass."

The legislation carried no appropriation, but provided for the appointment of a commission to select a sculptor, approve a statue and design and raise the necessary funds, \$30,000. Parentheti-

cally, there are no pictures of Dr. Whitman.

Gov. Arthur B. Langlie named a 12-person commission and this group, after considering proposals from 10 different sculptors, selected the statue design offered by Dr. Avard Fairbanks, dean of the College of Fine Arts, University of Utah.

People familiar with The Whitman Story have widely endorsed Dr. Fairbanks' interpretation of the man who did so much to assure the growth and development of the Pacific Northwest as a vital part of the United States.

The service to God, country, and his fellow men which marked the active career of Dr. Marcus Whitman is symbolized in this statue by Dr. Fairbanks. In his right hand, Dr. Whitman carries the Bible, which was his inspiration. In his left are plans and the saddlebags he used as "a doctor on horseback." Behind him is a representation of the rye grass from which the Indian name "Waiilatpu," the mission site, was secured.

OF HISTORIC RENOWN

In the dramatic history of the colonization and development of the Pacific Northwest, few individuals have a record of achievement as extensive or as significant as that of Dr. Marcus Whitman.

In achieving a record that made him "illustrious for (his) historic renown," Dr. Whitman's urge to action and adventure resulted in a dynamic career in the period from 1834 to 1847 that makes The Story of Marcus Whitman a colorful and dramatic chapter in western history. It is the story of—

An active and ambitious man who was the first graduate doctor of a medical school to practice west of the Rocky Mountains.

A strong and stalwart man who with Mrs. Whitman established the first American home on the Pacific coast. They were the parents of the first American white girl born west of the Rocky Mountains.

A determined and adventurous man who made one of the great rides of American history when he went 4,000 miles in the middle of winter from Waiilatpu to Washington, D. C., and Boston to plead for his mission and to tell the story of the greatness and potentialities of the Oregon Territory.

A versatile and aggressive man who brought the first wagon over the Rocky Mountains and who, in 1843, provided the leadership and guidance for the first great wagon train to come to the Oregon Territory.

A fearless and compassionate man who was massacred by an Indian's tomahawk while he was giving medical aid to those whom he came to befriend.

A dogmatic and religious man who stubbornly tried but failed in his objective of being a missionary to the Indians and to bring them to a realization of the white man's God.

Marcus Whitman was no ordinary man, but he was, instead, a man of personality and varied human characteristics. While he failed as a missionary to the Indians, he succeeded in so many other of his efforts as physician, agricul-

turist, explorer, and patriot that he shares fully with other illustrious citizens of the Nation the respect and admiration of those who appreciate outstanding service to God and country.

"The Story of Marcus Whitman" is indeed the story of a distinguished and important American.

THE IMPORTANT YEARS

Marcus Whitman was born in Rushville, N. Y., September 4, 1802, the son of Zeza and Alice Whitman. His father was a shoemaker and tanner and died when Marcus was 7.

After his father's death, he lived with an uncle and grandfather, both of whom were pious men and gave him constant religious care and instruction. When he was 17, he was greatly influenced by an evangelistic minister during a revival meeting and subsequently became an active church worker.

That religious activity continued during his practice of medicine, and in 1834, prompted by a desire to get into missionary work, he made application to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions for duty.

The great interest of the day was in providing Christian teachers for the Indians west of the Rocky Mountains. This interest had been stimulated by an account of a visit to St. Louis of a delegation of Flathead and Nez Perce Indians seeking information about the white man's religion.

The experiences of the succeeding 25 years, including his learning to become a doctor because training to be a minister took too long and was too expensive, provided him with knowledge and qualifications for the important part that he was to play in western history.

Some of this history, Mr. President, is certain to be of more than casual or passing interest to the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], who sits in the Chamber, because he, like the Senator from Washington, comes from that great area known as the western country.

In the career "to the West" that followed Dr. Whitman's decision to put his abilities to the service of Christ, episodes in 5 years were particularly outstanding and historically significant.

1835: An exploratory trip to the Northwest with the Reverend Samuel Parker to determine if missionary work was feasible among the Indians west of the Rocky Mountains. Whitman went as far west as Wyoming and then reported to the Board that a mission among the Indians of the upper Columbia River Valley was practicable.

1836: The journey to the Oregon Territory with his bride, Narcissa Prentiss, to establish the mission at Waiilatpu and to locate the first American home on the Pacific coast. There, on March 14, 1837, they became the parents of the first white girl, Alice Clarissa, born west of the Rocky Mountains.

1842-43: The ride east to save the mission and to plead the importance of the Oregon Territory. The return west to aid in bringing the first great wagon train to the rich territory and to start a new era in Oregon.

We can well afford to stop and talk about what Marcus Whitman was able to

do, because he meant and was determined to do it. Think of conditions in 1842-43 in the United States of America. There were then no bicycles. There was no air traffic. There were no jet planes. There were no automobiles. A man, Marcus Whitman, 3,500 miles from this Nation's Capital, was confronted with a problem which might result in eliminating the fine work he was attempting to do in his mission, and he wanted to talk to Members of the Congress and perhaps the President about it. So Marcus Whitman set out on foot and by horseback to go 3,500 miles to save his work from ruin, and then returned 3,500 miles to put that work back together again. It is good to have an opportunity, as a citizen of the Northwest country, to speak about Marcus Whitman.

The massacre by non-Christian Cayuse Indians on November 29, 1847, ended the lives of the Whitmans and destroyed the mission which they had built and to which they had given their lives, as so many Americans of this day are going to give their lives to make certain that our Nation is not destroyed. We shall be the more successful to the degree that we have the characteristics of Marcus Whitman and his kind within us, deep down inside.

THE GOOD DOCTOR

Marcus Whitman, "the Good Doctor," is the fourth physician and surgeon to be honored with a statue in the Nation's Hall of Fame.

Kentucky recognized Dr. Ephraim McDowell—1771-1830—who performed the first ovariectomy in 1809.

Florida presented a statue of Dr. John Gorrie—1803-55—the inventor of the ice machine and mechanical refrigerator, which, at that time, he thought would only be used for fever patients.

Georgia erected a statue to Dr. Crawford W. Long—1815-78—the discoverer of ether anesthesia in 1842.

Dr. Olaf Larsell, for many years a student of Pacific Northwestern medicine, paid this tribute to Dr. Whitman:

"We behold the first American, trained as a physician, to practice his profession in the great Northwest. We see a man, respected by all, who served his fellow men, an honor to the healing art.

"In the best traditions of the country practitioner he faced danger, hardship, storm, and flood to carry healing to his patients. He made no effort to save or spare himself but gave without stint or that which he had, professional and material. From the time he first set foot in old Oregon, he was recognized as, and has been called to the present, 'the Good Doctor.'"

That title of the Good Doctor first came to Marcus Whitman in what was perhaps one of the most widely observed operations in the history of American and possibly world medicine. It occurred August 13, 1835, when Dr. Whitman removed from the back of that famous mountaineer, Jim Bridger, a 3-inch iron arrow point which had become embedded below one scapula 3 years previously in a fight with some Blackfoot Indians.

The Bridger operation was performed at the crossing of the Green River in southwest Wyoming, without help of anesthetic, and in the presence of about 2,000 Indians and 200 white trappers.

Whitman studied medicine first in Rushville, N. Y., where, as was the custom of the times, he "rode out" with an experienced doctor, observing and studying for 2 years under his supervision. In 1825 he entered Fairfield Medical School, receiving a diploma on May 9, 1826, "with the privilege of practicing physic and surgery" in New York.

Calls in his country practice in upper New York State were all made on horseback, and he carried his home-made medicines and surgical instruments in two saddlebags. His 8 years of training and practice, including another 16 weeks' course at Fairfield, made him much better qualified than the average doctor of his day.

HOMEWARD BOUND

When Marcus and Narcissa Whitman stood on the crest of the Blue Mountains, August 29, 1836, and viewed before them the wonderful valley of the Columbia River, history was made.

For the first time, the eyes of an American white woman looked upon the valley. They had started the long trek westward from Rushville, N. Y., on March 3, following the wedding of Marcus Whitman and Narcissa Prentiss in the small Presbyterian church at Angelica, N. Y., February 18.

Missionary zeal had been the basis of their betrothal and the wedding. While originally friends, they had been brought together in the common desire of missionary work by the Reverend Samuel Parker when he was going through western New York holding meetings to raise funds for the support of missions among the Indians. Marcus Whitman heard him first and besought his aid in getting an appointment, while a few days later he was heard by Narcissa Prentiss, then a 26-year-old school teacher.

The American board wanted single men or married couples, and would not accept single women. The Reverend Mr. Parker saw an opportunity, and suggested marriage to Dr. Whitman, who had told him that he might take a wife if he got an appointment to a mission. When the appointment came, in January 1835, he went to Narcissa, proposed marriage, and was accepted. She then applied to the board, and was also accepted.

When Dr. Whitman returned from his exploratory trip with Rev. Mr. Parker, who continued to the West, he went about plans for the trip to establish the missions. The Reverend and Mrs. Henry Spalding and William Gray, a layman, agreed to accompany them.

On July 4, they reached the south pass of the Rocky Mountains and crossed the Continental Divide. Their wagon, converted into a two-wheeled cart, they managed to take as far as Fort Boise, then called Snake Fort, the first wheeled vehicle to go that far west. Just out of the fort, the party separated briefly, the Whitmans going on ahead.

On September 1, they reached Fort Walla Walla, on the Columbia; and on September 12, they were guests of Dr. John McLoughlin, the Hudson's Bay Co.'s factor, at Fort Vancouver, making the trip by water. On December 10, they were in their own home, a lean-to shack

at Wailatpu, the first American white home in the Northwest.

It was here that Alice Clarissa was born March 14, her mother's twenty-ninth birthday. On June 23, 1839, the child was drowned while playing by the Walla Walla River. By then Wailatpu had become "the cradle of the Pacific Northwest history."

THE MISSIONARY

Marcus Whitman is the seventh nationally known individual who achieved fame at least in part through religious activities, to be designated for commemoration through the placing of a statue in Statuary Hall.

California designated churchmen for both choices. One was Junipero Serra, 1713-84, missionary of the Franciscan Order, who founded nine missions. The other was Thomas Starr King, 1824-64, like Whitman, born in New York. An ordained minister, he is credited with being "the man whose matchless oratory saved California to the Union."

Pennsylvania chose J. P. G. Muhlenberg, 1746-1807. He was a distinguished minister of the gospel, a colonel in the Revolutionary War, and a member of the House of Representatives in the First, Third, and Sixth Congresses.

Rhode Island selected Roger Williams, 1609-83, an early Puritan pioneer minister of the gospel in the Colonies and among the Indians. He was famed for his zeal and ability, especially in the cause of liberty.

Utah, for its first choice, recently placed a statue of Brigham Young, in commemoration of his leading the great Mormon migration to Utah and the establishment of Salt Lake City.

Wisconsin recognized James Marquette, 1637-75, a French Jesuit priest. He was a missionary among the wild tribes of Indians of the northern country, a discoverer and explorer.

Had it not been for the fact that becoming a minister required a long and expensive period of training, Marcus Whitman would have made religion his complete career, and his story would have been much different.

Like Reverend Spalding, who came west with him in 1836, and like others who followed to work in other missions of the Northwest, Marcus Whitman's main objective was to bring religion to the Indians, and whatever other abilities he had, he felt were just to aid him in that direction.

At Wailatpu, August 18, 1838, Whitman and Spalding led the organization of the first Protestant Church west of the Rocky Mountains. It was Presbyterian, governed on the congregational plan.

This was immediately followed by the arrival of a party of missionaries that included Mr. and Mrs. William H. Gray, Mr. and Mrs. Cushing Eells, Mr. and Mrs. Elkanah Walker, Mr. and Mrs. A. B. Smith, and Cornelius Rogers.

The missionaries were people of intense convictions and strong wills. Though in hopes for their work they were as one, they soon clashed over the conduct of the missionary work. Critical letters went back to the American board; and before word could be sent that the differences had been smoothed out, a

message came with a large emigrant party in 1842, ordering the closure of Waiilatpu and Lapwai, recalling Spalding, and locating the other missionaries at Tshimakain.

Reluctantly, the others agreed to a proposal by Whitman that he go east to the board to plead their case; and on October 3, 1842, he was on his way.

THE OREGON COUNTRY

Marcus Whitman, the shoemaker's son, lived in a period of American history when the still young Nation was already in the throes of an expansion that its vigorous and adventurous people required.

Accompanying that desire for increasing the physical limits of the expanding country was an almost universal and emotional reaction by the people to a deep sense of religion. Both of these characteristics took Whitman into his place in western life, without his knowing or understanding what the over-all factors were.

He moved west into a land that was virtually unknown, but in which there was a great and growing interest, and a strong degree of conflict. This was especially true of the Oregon country.

Until the treaty of 1846 finally resolved the differences of the nations that claimed the vast Oregon region and extended the boundary of the United States along the forty-ninth parallel to the Pacific Ocean, that region lying west of the Rocky Mountains and between Mexican California and Russian Alaska was in a sense no man's land.

In the succession of events leading up to that treaty, the direction and stimulus provided by Dr. Whitman and his efforts toward greater colonization and development were especially significant. English papers of the times were saying: "However the political question between England and America as to the owners of Oregon may be decided, Oregon will never be colonized overland from the Eastern States."

A treaty of joint occupancy in 1818 left the Oregon country open to nationals of the United States and Great Britain alike. In 1819, Spain gave up her claims to the region north of 42°; and by the treaties of St. Petersburg in 1824 and 1825, Russia relinquished her claims south of 54° and 40°.

American claims to the Oregon country were based upon the discovery of the Columbia River by Robert Gray—1792; the exploration of Lewis and Clark—1803–1806; establishment of fur-trading posts by Astor's Pacific Fur Co.—1811; and the relinquishment of Spanish rights to the coast north of 42 degrees by the Adams-Onís Treaty for the purchase of Florida—1819.

Control of Oregon then rested generally in the hands of the powerful British Hudson Bay Co. American traders, adventurers, and explorers, however, had developed considerable interest in the region on the part of the United States.

It was into such an era of challenging competition and action and adventure that Marcus Whitman moved with his idea that "My plans require time and distance."

WAGONS WEST

Travel under adverse circumstances that would halt a man of lesser courage was commonplace to Marcus Whitman, both in his days as a country doctor in New York, and his first years at Waiilatpu. It was well for him and for the future of the Oregon Territory that he was so capable and courageous.

The ride east on behalf of the work of the missions was taken in company with A. L. Lovejoy, a New England lawyer and recent immigrant. They left Waiilatpu on October 2, 1842, with Washington, D. C., and Boston as their objectives, undaunted by the fact that much of the trip would be made in the most severe part of the winter.

It proved to be one of the most difficult rides in American history. Unfriendly Indian tribes made it necessary to avoid South Pass and to detour southward. Near what is now Gunnison, Colo., they nearly lost their lives fording the Colorado River.

In the mountainous country near Taos their food gave out. After eating their pack mules and finally, their dogs, they were near starvation. Rescued by a party of hunters, they continued on, Dr. Whitman going ahead to Boston after short visits in Washington, D. C., with Government officials, and in New York with Horace Greeley, whom he impressed with the great potentialities of the Oregon country.

Returning West, he joined some 1,000 immigrants who assembled near Independence, Mo., to take part in what was then the largest group to attempt the trip across the Nation to Oregon. They were dubious about taking wagons all the way to the Columbia, but Whitman assured them it could be done and May 22 the trek began.

At Fort Hall, near the present Pocatello, Idaho, Hudson's Bay Co. officials advised them to leave the wagons and go by horseback, but again Whitman's advice and encouragement prevailed. He became their guide and with the knowledge gained from his own travels and what he knew had been done with wagons that had reached the Columbia in 1840, he headed the party west.

Dr. Whitman guided the wagon train from Fort Hall to the Grande Ronde River, just east of Waiilatpu, leaving in response to a message that the Spaldings were desperately ill with scarlet fever.

The significance of the 1843 immigration and the people, livestock, and equipment that came with it, was great for with it a new era dawned in Oregon. It set the precedent for the subsequent history of the Oregon Trail and made the Northwest and its resources more secure for the United States of America.

THE MASSACRE

The success which Marcus Whitman achieved as the first great farmer of the Northwest, and as the effective operator of a service center for emigrants moving into the Oregon Territory, contributed to a substantial degree to the tragic end of his mission.

He had erred at the outset in deciding to settle among the Cayuse tribe, against the advice of the more friendly Nez Perce. He had his plans and reasons,

however, and it seemed to him that Waiilatpu was a logical place for the headquarters of a chain of missions.

Whitman excelled in development of the resources of the soil. So much so, in fact, that as the settlers came into the Territory they found such an evidence of abundance that word went back East that here indeed was the land of opportunity.

With the way opened to wagon traffic through the 1843 immigration in which Dr. Whitman was a key figure, homeseekers literally poured into the country. After 1844 most sought a shorter route to the south and Waiilatpu lost some of its activity.

The lessening activity was not enough to allay the reviving fears of the Indians, who had become less and less peaceful after 1840.

A severe winter in 1846–47 resulted in the loss of many Indians' horses, rousing their discontent. The 1847 immigration brought with it a particularly virulent form of measles and dysentery which hit Indians and whites alike. Dr. Whitman did his best to minister to the sick, but the Indians could not understand why he cured so many of the whites while his Indian patients usually died. Their habit of taking hot steam baths and then of jumping into the cold river probably killed many who might have survived otherwise.

Treacherous statements by half-breed Joe Lewis that Dr. Whitman, the successful farmer, was poisoning the Indians in order that he might have their lands increased their suspicions. They had debated killing him in 1844 after Elijah, the son of the Walla Walla chief, Peupemoxmox, had been murdered by a white man.

The Indian tribal custom called for someone of equal rank among a murderer's people to be marked for death. In the 1847 treachery, however, it was the Indian belief that a "tewat" or medicine man had to be killed to cure a person poisoned by a "tewat."

About 2 o'clock the afternoon of November 29, 1847, Dr. Whitman was called to the door by an Indian request for medicine. He was struck from behind by a tomahawk and the attack against the virtually helpless whites was on. Before the assault ended, 13 had been killed, Mrs. Whitman being the only woman victim.

With the massacre, Waiilatpu became a memorial to its martyred missionaries, and has properly remained so to this day.

Mr. President, if the junior Senator from Washington understands in part the future which lies before all of us, it will be very largely filled and our time occupied, both within the Senate and in the case of all citizens throughout the land, by nothing less than a great deal of blood, a great deal of sweat, and a flood of human tears. I think that is mostly what we shall be able to look forward to for a long time to come.

As I have been privileged this afternoon to recite a few of what I consider to be the facts surrounding the life of Marcus Whitman in our great Northwest, I have derived a sense of satisfaction and encouragement from a man who in the past helped build America.

He dealt, as we of this generation must, with blood and sweat and tears. The results of the suffering of Marcus Whitman and his death gave to America a great and promising new frontier across the Nation. I join with many others in feeling that out of the blood, sweat, and tears of this generation we perhaps shall be able to provide for succeeding generations in the distant future a civilization at peace, a civilization that will be worth living in. I am not prepared to say when the State of Washington will officially send the statue of Marcus Whitman to the Capitol, to take its glorious place in Statuary Hall, but for the benefit of those among my constituents who are keenly interested in the matter, I should like to tell them in whose company Marcus Whitman will stand. As of the last reading, 74 statues have been contributed by 40 American States to Statuary Hall, which is but a few feet from where we sit and from where I speak this afternoon. Of those, 70 represent two statues received from each of 35 States. Four States, Minnesota, Arizona, South Dakota, and Louisiana, have contributed but one statue each. The nine States not thus far represented are Colorado, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming, and Utah.

Mr. President, whenever I have an opportunity, I go to Statuary Hall to look at those men from out of the past and from States other than the State of Washington, to understand, if I can, what nature of men it was who built the great opportunity which was given to us by those who went before. How happy I shall be to know that Marcus Whitman, from my own State of Washington, will shortly join other pioneers and builders of days gone by. I desire to read these names as rapidly but as thoughtfully as I can, in bringing to a close this record and this brief treatment of the fullness of a man's life:

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF THE 74 STATUES
CONTRIBUTED BY STATES

Samuel Adams, Massachusetts.
William Allen, Ohio.
Ethan Allen, Vermont.
Stephen F. Austin, Texas.
Charles Brantley Aycock, North Carolina.
Gen. William Henry H. Beadle, South Dakota.
Thomas H. Benton, Missouri.
William Jennings Bryan, Nebraska.
Francis P. Blair, Missouri.
William E. Borah, Idaho.
John C. Calhoun, South Carolina.
Charles Carroll, Maryland.
Lewis Cass, Michigan.
Zachariah Chandler, Kentucky.
Henry Clay, Kentucky.
John M. Clayton, Delaware.
James P. Clarke, Arkansas.
George Clinton, New York.
Jacob Collamer, Vermont.
J. L. M. Curry, Alabama.
Jefferson Davis, Mississippi.
Robert Fulton, Pennsylvania.
James A. Garfield, Ohio.
James Z. George, Mississippi.
George W. Glick, Kansas.
John Gorrie, Florida.
Nathanael Greene, Rhode Island.
John Campbell Greenway, Arizona.
Hannibal Hamlin, Maine.
Wade Hampton, South Carolina.
John Hanson, Maryland.

James Harland, Iowa.
Samuel Houston, Texas.
John J. Ingalls, Kansas.
Andrew Jackson, Tennessee.
Philip Kearney, New Jersey.
John E. Kenna, West Virginia.
Thomas Starr King, California.
William King, Maine.
S. J. Kirkwood, Iowa.
Robert M. La Follette, Wisconsin.
Robert E. Lee, Virginia.
Robert R. Livingston, New York.
Dr. Crawford W. Long, Georgia.
Huey P. Long, Louisiana.
James Marquette, Wisconsin.
Ephraim McDowell, Kentucky.
J. Sterling Morton, Nebraska.
Oliver P. Morton, Indiana.
J. P. G. Muhlenberg, Pennsylvania.
Francis H. Pierpont, West Virginia.
Henry M. Rice, Minnesota.
Caesar Rodney, Delaware.
Will Rogers, Oklahoma.
Uriah M. Rose, Arkansas.
Sequoyah, Oklahoma.
Junipero Serra, California.
John Sevier, Tennessee.
Roger Sherman, Connecticut.
James Shields, Illinois.
George L. Shoup, Idaho.
E. Kirby Smith, Florida.
John Stark, New Hampshire.
Alexander H. Stephens, Georgia.
Richard Stockton, New Jersey.
Jonathan Trumbull, Connecticut.
Zebulon B. Vance, North Carolina.
Gen. Lew Wallace, Indiana.
George Washington, Virginia.
Daniel Webster, New Hampshire.
Gen. Joe Wheeler, Alabama.
Frances E. Willard, Illinois.
Roger Williams, Rhode Island.
John Winthrop, Massachusetts.

Mr. President, because Dr. Marcus Whitman, of Walla Walla, and of the State of Washington has earned the right to stand in the company of such great names as I have mentioned, I am completely satisfied that all of them will move over and bid him welcome when in due time his statue comes across the Nation.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 726)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on pp. 16040-16041.)

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION—BOOK BY MAX LOWENTHAL

A PATTERN OF DESTRUCTION OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to refer briefly to a book entitled "The Federal Bureau of Investigation," written by Max Lowenthal.

DELIBERATE INTENT

At this time I do not propose to go into the contents of the book or the activities of its author, except to say that the book is obviously written by a man whose deliberate intent is to cause trouble between the President of the

United States and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

BOOK A REHASH

Most of the book is a rehash of some of Mr. Lowenthal's own work when he was employed by the Norris committee some years ago. The committee's report was favorable to the FBI. Although I shall not go into all the evidence, some parts of it are now being used on the other side, as condemning the FBI.

LONG-RANGE PATTERN

If this attack was an isolated instance it could be excused as an irresponsible flight of fancy by a comparative non-entity—but it follows too closely the pattern of destruction of responsible Government to be ignored.

DESTROY COMMUNIST RECORDS

The distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] ably informed us on this subject last Monday. The House Un-American Activities Committee has suggested the author's motive in writing the book. As a matter of fact, all one need do is to read the book to learn that the author would like to destroy the FBI and its records of Communists, fellow travelers, and deluded dupes.

I have learned that Members of both Houses of Congress, Federal judges, educators, and newspapermen received copies of the volume. The method of distribution and the extent of distribution suggests that it was a propaganda book.

PROPAGANDA BOOK

The fact that the author has a motive does not account for the fact that the book was published and placed on desks of persons who could be expected to mold some opinion or pass some judgment on the FBI and its activities. Ordinarily, books are published as a commercial venture—in anticipation of profit. Sometimes books are published at a loss in order that profit might come other ways, or that an objective, usually sinister, may be achieved.

When a book priced at \$4.50 is given away in wholesale quantity, we can assume that the motive of publication is not entirely one of profit. This suspicion may grow when it can be recalled that the same publisher last year released such a book as *The Sure Thing*, by Merle Miller, a vicious attack on the loyalty program as it affects State Department employees.

The publisher, by the way, is William Sloane and Associates, Inc., of New York City. The book was accompanied by a letter signed by Mr. Norman Hood, vice president, which said:

This unbiased and profoundly conservative approach will, I think, lead you to some startling conclusions.

STARTLING CONCLUSIONS—RECORD OF UNDERSTATEMENT

I must say that I did come to a startling conclusion, namely, that the author views the work of the FBI as impartially and unbiased as that great fountain of lies, slander, and abuse, the Moscow press and radio. Mr. Lowenthal is as objective against the FBI as is the Communist Party in America. His is one of a series

of attacks on the FBI that have sprouted mysteriously since the conviction of Communist leaders and Red spies, and the exposures of red-handed dabblers in treason and their apprentices, the fellow dabblers.

Mr. President, there has been called to my attention a number of facts about the publishers and the executive editor for the publishers at the time the book was accepted for publication. The facts which have come to my attention are sufficient to cause me to believe that the publishers are very definitely on the side of Communist sympathizers. At this time I am not going into these details.

I merely want to say a word in defense of the FBI. It seems strange that this great organization should need any defense.

FBI THE LAST STAND BETWEEN THE ADMINISTRATION AND SUBVERSIVE GROUPS

The FBI is the last stand between the administration and utter surrender to subversive elements. During months of exposure of the connection between certain Government officials and those who would bring destruction on this country, it has been a source of satisfaction to many of us to know that we have the FBI, an organization entirely above suspicion of any kind. It is only natural that the subversives who have been investigated by the FBI and their defenders would like to destroy FBI records for personal reasons. The FBI has been one organization in our Government which these traitors have not been able to touch.

LOWENTHAL'S REWARD FOR THE BOOK

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of a purported telegram to Robert Murphy, United States political adviser for Germany, from Secretary of State Acheson.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

War Department advises that Max Lowenthal leaving soon for Berlin to assume position legal division, OMGUS, as adviser on problems of restitution, sequestration, and disposition of Jewish heirless property fund. I have had close associations with Lowenthal for many years and am confident that he has the high competence, standing, and experience in public affairs necessary to aid materially in solution of these problems. He has discussed his assignment and related questions fully with Hildring and other interested officials of the Department, and we are anxious to make certain that he will have every assistance and cooperation Department can afford him in connection with his work. Hildring and I shall personally appreciate any help that you can give him in Germany.

ACHESON, *Acting.*

Mr. MALONE. Apparently the reward for the unwarranted attack upon the most reputable departments of the Government is to be ample.

THE STRANGE CASE OF MICHAEL LEE, PET OF THE PATTERN

In regard to the administration's typical attitude toward these pink followers I refer to the case of one Michael Lee, who was exposed by the junior Senator from Nevada as a dangerous security risk in a key Government position—a part of the long-range pattern. While I was on a recent inspection tour with other members of the Public Works Committee the

Secretary of Commerce took a rather peculiar action in this case. The loyalty board of his Department had found Mr. Lee guilty as charged and requested his expulsion. The Secretary of Commerce reversed this finding, technically clearing Mr. Lee, and then discharged him as a poor security risk.

PRESS RELEASE PROVED FALSE

Mr. President, it will be remembered that at the time this matter was brought up on the Senate floor, it was assigned to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and a subcommittee of that committee investigated the case. In the testimony it was brought out that at the time the junior Senator from Nevada made the first statement on the floor, the release cleared Mr. Lee, stating that all the charges were old charges, that they had been investigated, and that he was cleared. As a matter of fact, the junior Senator from Nevada had information at that time that he had not been cleared.

The statement released to the press by a Department of Commerce official was proved false—but the official was still there.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE DISCHARGED LEE AND REMINGTON

Mr. President, when this matter came before the committee the testimony was given by the junior Senator from Nevada, and then certain other witnesses were heard.

Without going into detail, I may say that Mr. Sawyer stopped the examination abruptly by discharging Mr. Lee, and also Mr. Remington, whose record was very closely allied with Mr. Lee.

Mr. Remington was under indictment in New York very soon thereafter.

LEE NEVER CLEARED BY LOYALTY BOARD

Testimony was brought out to the effect that Mr. Lee had never been cleared by his own loyalty board, that they had not found enough against him to convict him of actual disloyalty, but had found enough against him to recommend that he was a dangerous security risk.

SAWYER'S ACTION INEXCUSABLE

The action subsequently taken by Mr. Sawyer, after the loyalty board of the Department of Commerce had actually found him guilty, was unexplainable and inexcusable. I do not know what was in the mind of the Secretary of Commerce, but I am inclined to believe that his action permits Mr. Lee to get another Federal job, in another department, and I am inclined to believe that it was done for the particular purpose of allowing Mr. Lee to show up on another payroll in another department, as has been done so many times in the past 15 years. It is almost impossible, out of a million and a half people, to keep track of all of them. In any case, the action was inexcusable on Mr. Sawyer's part, as well as deliberate.

SUCH ACTION TOO PREVALENT

This sort of thing has been done entirely too much. Subversives and sympathizers have gone off one payroll, disappeared briefly, and then reappeared on another Government payroll, often in a more important position. I understand that some of the homosex-

uals who were exposed in the State Department simply moved to another department.

MR. LEE AND THE DEFENSE OF CHINA

It will be recalled that the National Government of China blamed Mr. Lee more than any other Government official for delays in vital shipments of ethane gasoline and other war supplies to war-swept China until too late for the National Government to use them effectively against the Reds.

I recall, and testimony will be found to the effect, that General MacArthur determined that gasoline was such a necessity that he took a large supply of the barrels of gasoline from his meager supply and shipped them to China, in lieu of what they were supposed to get from the Department of Commerce, as authorized by the Congress and approved by the President, but the shipment of which was delayed inexcusably by the Department of Commerce, with Mr. Lee at the head of the Far Eastern Division.

INFORMATION OF INTEREST TO RED CHINA

There was nothing in writing by Mr. Lee, but the written replies to his evident telephone requests showed that he asked about the storage capacity in China, where it was located, the number of troops in training, where they were located, the number of planes they had, commercial planes and passenger planes, information of no interest to Mr. Lee or the Government or the department he represented, but it was of great interest to the Soviets, the "agrarian reformers," which Mr. Marshall had discovered in 1946. It was information that could be of importance only to an opposing army. So this man was "cleared" in order that he could get another job with another department.

CONGRESSMAN JUDD REPEATEDLY URGED INVESTIGATION

Representative WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, according to a press dispatch, repeatedly urged the Department of Commerce to investigate Lee, and charged unconscionable delay in aiding China. Mr. JUDD alleged that although the China-aid bill was passed by Congress April 31, 1947, it took until July to get the paper work set up. When the British needed help after Dunkerque, President Roosevelt had ships loaded and moving in only 8 days. No real material reached China until December 8, months after Congress authorized the aid. Mr. JUDD called it suspicious and unjustifiable to have a foreigner of Russian lineage and pro-Russian leanings, heading exports to help that strategic area.

A CHINESE-BORN RUSSIAN

The man we refer to as Michael Lee is Ephraim Zinovi Liberman, of Russian parents, born in Harbin, China, and in three attempts was denied American citizenship because he was not attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States. On the fourth try, after changing his name to Michael Lee, he made it—that was in 1941—and almost immediately we find him as head of the Far Eastern Division of the Office of International Trade in our own Department of Commerce.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I did not quite understand the Senator's statement. Did the person in question change his name four times, and after the fourth change, he was admitted?

Mr. MALONE. He changed his name only once, but he made three applications for citizenship and was turned down because he was not attached to the principles of the Constitution. On the fourth trial, after he had married an American girl, he made it.

Mr. LANGER. He changed his name?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. From what to what?

Mr. MALONE. From Ephraim Zinovi Liberman to Michael Lee.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MALONE. I am giving the Senate this background to show the incongruity of the action in high places apparently designed to make it possible for a man of this character and background to get back on the Federal payroll in another department after he was found disloyal and a dangerous security risk by the Department's own loyalty board.

We need more Government offices like the FBI.

A TYPICAL CASE—A PATTERN

Mr. President, the investigation into this case was typical. I had made a direct charge and suggested calling for the FBI records. That is all a matter of testimony.

The request was made by the chairman of the committee.

FBI RECORDS NOT AVAILABLE

But, Mr. President, the FBI records were not available. The President of the United States said they were not available to the Congress of the United States. Therefore the discharge in this case was surprising even to some of us. Mr. Sawyer became a little nervous and fired both men, in order to stop the investigation. But it is more surprising that he should clear the man after his own Department board had later convicted him and then fire him as a "security risk."

THE RESOLUTION FOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi was not in the Chamber when the Senator from Nevada began speaking. Will the Senator give us again the date of the investigation, and what committee the Senator was speaking of?

Mr. MALONE. I do not recall the date of the investigation.

Mr. STENNIS. Can the Senator give it approximately?

Mr. MALONE. I do not recall the date when the junior Senator from Nevada made the first charge on the Senate floor, but the resolution providing for the investigation, Senate Resolution 230, was submitted during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. The resolution provides:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, in pur-

suance of section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation and administration of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not that Bureau is being operated in accordance with the law, the public interest, and the intent of the Congress.

Such study and investigation shall include, but shall not be limited to, an examination into the qualifications, honesty, competency, efficiency, and loyalty of people employed by the Department of Commerce, and particularly the qualifications, honesty, competency, efficiency, and loyalty of Michael J. Lee, formerly known as Ephraim Zinovi Liberman, Chief of the Far Eastern Division of the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

THE INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE

I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that on March 28, 30, and April 4, 1950, a subcommittee, headed by the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], including as its members the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], conducted the investigation. It held three hearings. During the third hearing, or very soon thereafter, Mr. Sawyer took the action, as already outlined, apparently obtaining an agreement to stop the hearings, because nothing else was done in that connection. Then the action described earlier took place.

PRESENT STATUS OF MR. LEE

Mr. STENNIS. At that point the junior Senator from Mississippi came into the Chamber. What was the subsequent action? Does the Senator say he is still employed?

Mr. MALONE. No. The subsequent action was the immediate discharge of Mr. Liberman—Mr. Lee now—and of Mr. Remington, who was associated in a general way with all these activities. But Mr. Remington submitted to the discharge, and Mr. Lee did not.

Then hearings were held before the Department of Commerce. I am not entirely familiar with the hearings that were held, but the Loyalty Board of the Department of Commerce subsequently found him guilty. The Senator understands that each department has its own loyalty board. After the loyalty board of that Department found him guilty

and subsequent to the time Mr. Sawyer discharged him, Mr. Sawyer then cleared him of disloyalty so that now he is available for appointment in any another department of Government—in the Department of Commerce, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. STENNIS. But he is not now employed by the Department of Commerce.

LONG UNDER INVESTIGATION BUT NEVER SEPARATED

Mr. MALONE. No. He is separated from the Department for the first time. I will say further to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that all during this time, after his employment by the Department of Commerce, he had been under investigation. Apparently, however, he had never even been temporarily separated from the powerful position he had as head of the Far Eastern Division.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator a question for information. After an individual has been found guilty by the loyalty board of a department, can the head of the department then exonerate him and make him eligible for further appointment merely by a statement issued by the head of the department?

Mr. MALONE. I have not read the official statement, but the press carried it. It said, however, that the Secretary had completely cleared him, so he could now be rehired in the Department of Commerce, as I understand it, or in any other department of the Government. The dispatch said he was cleared of all disloyalty. It further said he had been discharged by the Secretary himself, after his own department loyalty board had found Lee guilty.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. As I understand, there was a finding of guilty by the loyalty board, but still he is eligible for employment now in the Department of Commerce or in any other department.

Mr. MALONE. I am given to understand that is a fact. I understand there is nothing against his record whatever so far as the Secretary is concerned. The Secretary cleared him simply by making an arbitrary statement.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I was not here when the measure relating to loyalty boards was passed. I understand each department has a separate board?

EACH DEPARTMENT DOES OWN INVESTIGATING

Mr. MALONE. Yes. The junior Senator from Nevada had never gone into that subject until he made his statement on the Senate floor. Then it became necessary for me to do so. I found that each department of government, the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, and so forth, has its own loyalty board and does its own investigating when any subject for investigation comes up, or when any accusation is made against a member of the department, just as a family would conduct its own investigation if an accusation of

wrongdoing were made against a member of the family.

If the matter is pressed beyond the loyalty board of the Department, another board, the President's Loyalty Board, appointed by him and responsible only to him—not at all to the Congress of the United States—can consider the case further—conduct a further investigation or reverse the finding of the Department board. That Board can clear an accused person or find him guilty. However, it seems that Board never has held anyone to be really guilty. It operates in a peculiar fashion. It seems to operate to clear an individual rather than hearing evidence.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I am impressed with the case he is presenting.

Mr. MALONE. I will say further to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that the junior Senator from Nevada introduced a bill immediately thereafter which provided for setting up a loyalty board by Congress, members thereof to be appointed by the President and approved by the Senate, so that the Congress would have some responsibility in the matter. A board set up by law could not simply clear an individual arbitrarily regardless of the evidence. It would be responsible to this body. The bill, however, is held in committee.

Mr. President, I had not intended to go so far into Mr. Liberman's case because it is closed now. At least, he is discharged and, so far as we know, has not yet been rehired in another department.

Mr. President, I wish to speak on another matter now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada may proceed.

GEN. DOUGLAS MAC ARTHUR

Mr. MALONE. The subject to which I am about to refer represents another attack on the remaining sound personnel in the administration. It is typically illustrated in the attack on Gen. Douglas MacArthur. There is no question in the mind of the junior Senator from Nevada that General MacArthur was slated for discharge very soon after election.

ATTACK ON MAC ARTHUR NOT POPULAR

But as things have turned out it seems that MacArthur is still very popular with the American people, and that it would not meet with popular approval if the President or Mr. Acheson, Secretary of State, were to attack MacArthur. So it seems that the attack now rather is coming from Europe, particularly from England.

AN INDIRECT ATTACK

The attack seems to be an indirect attack. No doubt there is a long-distance telephone connecting Washington with the nations now under the Marshall plan.

A CONTINUATION OF THE PATTERN

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a dispatch which shows that the attack is the same kind of attack as that which is being made on the FBI, although neither of the attacks is being made directly, because both MacArthur and Mr. Hoover of the FBI are much too popular for that.

PUBLIC RESPECT MR. HOOVER AND GENERAL
MAC ARTHUR

Both Mr. Hoover, the head of the FBI, and General MacArthur are persons whom the American people respect and like very much, because they have a great deal of courage, which they demonstrate every day in their respective fields.

Both General MacArthur and Mr. Hoover have demonstrated again and again that they will do very well indeed if they are allowed to fight, or, in the case of Mr. Hoover, if he is allowed to make the investigations which he thinks should be made.

This dispatch is dated at Paris, November 25, a little after the election. The dispatch appeared in the international edition of the New York Times for Sunday, November 26. The headline reads as follows: "Europe is dubious on United States aim in Korea. Nations burdened by defense cost wonder if MacArthur is now going too far."

Just how they are burdened by defense costs, when we are putting up so much money for their defense and for the Marshall plan, is not clear. Nevertheless, these nations may be afraid that they might have to put up some money, and that if this situation continues it might be necessary for them to use some of their own military forces, if we continue to use our men abroad, in Korea, as bait, as has been mentioned several times.

The article reads as follows:

The second Korean crisis provoked by the Chinese intervention has coincided with new pressure on Indochina and second thoughts on Western rearmament in a way that doubly emphasizes the notable differences of view between Washington and the European capitals.

The United States decision in June to resist the Korean invasion came as an almost joyful surprise to most Europeans. To them it meant that the United States would act to resist aggression anywhere, a point on which there had been doubts.

Within the last couple of days—

This dispatch is dated November 25, but it was published in the New York Times on November 26—

as Gen. Douglas MacArthur's forces have pushed toward the Yalu River, there have been dismay and fear lest the United States should act too much and go too far in the policy so heartily applauded in June.

The advance toward the Yalu River was first described here as an independent action by General MacArthur but is now interpreted as a United States diplomatic move. Neither construction of it pleases the French or British who doubted that it was the best means of getting a peaceful deal with Peiping.

The French would like to throw Indochina into the already large collection of Far Eastern problems under international discussion, thus escaping from the doctrine pronounced by Dean Acheson, United States Secretary of State, last May that the defense of Indochina was primarily the responsibility of the French and native states.

Of course, Mr. President, I was in Saigon, and elsewhere in Indochina, about the time, or a little after, we had chosen as our man the French representative in that area, to uphold his hand in the ruling of Indochina and putting down all insurrections. The Communists had a man there, too. The folks

who live there did not have anyone. We are not taking their part, either; we are supporting colonialism by the empire-minded nations in that area, to keep the people of that area under the yoke of France, just as in Singapore the British are doing the same thing. In other words, we are backing colonialism in the Far East, just as we are backing colonialism in Africa.

I have described before the visit I made on that occasion, so I shall not go into detail now about it. It was made at the time when the armies were facing each other in Indochina. No one then seemed to be for the Indonesians. Some persons were for the Dutch; but the Indonesians have worked that out now.

Everywhere we go we seem to be ready to aid someone who wishes to put a yoke on the native people. The evidence indicated to me that all those native people hate our guts right down to the ground, because we are backing those who are keeping the yoke on them.

I continue to read the dispatch:

There would be no violent objection here if Formosa were sacrificed to a modus vivendi with Peiping that would end the pressure on Indochina.

In other words, there would be no objection in Europe if we sacrificed Formosa and withdrew from it.

I read further from the dispatch:

The French concern to liquidate or reduce the burden of the Indochinese war has been intensified by its growing financial cost at a time when the financing of France's share in European rearmament has become a major problem for the Government, even though the United States is helping.

Mr. President, I should say, "Even though the United States is giving them much more money than anything in Indochina is costing them." We are financing that deal.

I read further from the dispatch:

Premier Rene Plevin's newspaper has sought to reassure the public by explaining that taxes next year will rise by only about 9 percent and that this rise will eat up only 2 percent of an increasing national income. But these statistics do not prevent the new budget from being a first-class headache for the Plevin Cabinet as it faces a Parliament whose normal aversion to taxation is redoubled by the approach of a national election.

The financial burden of the present defense program for Frenchmen would be perhaps twice what it is were it not for United States aid in the form of both credits and finished material. About 20 percent of the defense expenditure written into the budget this week will be supplied by the United States. Probably 50 percent or more of the total outlay on French armament in the coming year will be furnished by the United States, counting war material as well as dollar credits.

Moreover, about one-third of the industrial investment proposed under the Monnet plan for 1951 will come from the counterpart fund created by the Marshall plan.

Mr. President, the Monnet plan, I have described at various times. I had a 3-hour conference with Mr. Monnet in France in 1947. At that time he outlined all these nice projects they were going to build in France with our money.

At the end of his talk, I inquired as to who would own the projects when they were finished. I was told that France, of course, would own them, or that the French Government would own them. I asked, "Is any method of amortization or for making interest payments being provided?" However, it seemed that there was no thought of such a thing.

So I told Mr. Monnet that such a procedure was just a little strange to me. I said that I had been connected with most of the large projects in the western part of the United States, such as Boulder Dam and Hoover Dam, and that before most of them were begun and before the beginning of their construction was permitted, we required that definite arrangements be made for the amortization of their cost and for the payment of the interest.

However, under the Monnet plan, the French Government will own all the projects we are building there. In short, we are putting the French Government in that business. It seems a little unusual, but it seems to be accepted now that that is the thing to do. That is the great Monnet plan.

I read further from the dispatch:

There are therefore no important French voices urging emancipation from United States aid, as there apparently are in Britain, where some members of the Labor Party seem to believe that Washington pushes Britain into more rearmament than she can afford.

Of course, Mr. President, we may push them into more rearmament than we can afford, if this keeps up.

I read further from the dispatch:

Yet the difference between the Washington approach and the French approach was illustrated by Foreign Minister Robert Schuman's speech in Strasbourg yesterday when he defended the French plan for a European army as an effort to carry a political objective into the military sphere.

In other words, Mr. President, we are the push behind the western European defenses, and no European nation seems to be very much interested.

I read further from the dispatch:

The German approach appears similar in the sense that the western Germans want to barter their military contribution to acquire greater sovereignty.

Consequently there is lacking in Europe both the sense of urgency and the singleness of purpose that distinguished the United States efforts to build up western defenses. Here rearmament has many aspects that are sometimes overlooked or underestimated in Washington.

For example, behind the prospective visit to Washington of a delegation of the European Marshall plan council early in December—

I may say that as a part of this foreign influence we now hear about the proposed visit of Attlee, who will arrive in just a little while. Apparently they are not able to make exactly clear what they want over long distance; even though they have been running our foreign policy for a long time, it is going to be necessary for them to come over here now to explain it in more detail, in order to continue the direction we are going.

Is the desire of Europeans to be assured that if they economize on vital raw materials,

the result will not be merely that the excess thus saved will go into United States stockpiles at rising prices. This is an aspect of rearmament that worries Europeans as they face new payments deficits, but that has hardly yet been discussed by higher officials.

Economic Cooperation Administration officials were delighted when the European Payments Union managed to deal with the Western German payments deficit, even though the Washington officials had refused a request for additional aid. They believed this was a good example of the Europeans facing their problems without United States help.

But the goal of European financial independence has receded into a perhaps distant future as a result of the new defense programs. Marshall plan aid may be ended in 1952, as originally provided, but other United States aid, for both normal and defense production, will replace it.

Mr. President, that would be the Gray plan, the great plan that picks up with millions of dollars after the Marshall plan ends, and invests in everything in sight, and looks around for more things in which to invest. The Gray plan attempts to show us that the United States must continue to divide its wealth voluntarily, until the Torquay conference can level the tariffs and import fees and divide our markets with the other nations of the world. That is a great plan.

Consequently the delicate diplomacy between the giver of aid and the recipients—

It is a very delicate thing. It is a very delicate situation—

between the giver of aid and the recipients which has characterized the Marshall plan, with the United States insisting upon collective achievements that Europeans often were reluctant to undertake, may now be extended into the future and into the economic and military fields.

EUROPE'S ATTACK ON MAC ARTHUR

That is a very interesting thing. But the most interesting thing of all, Mr. President, is that the attack upon MacArthur is now coming from Europe, namely, from England, from France, and from other nations. As the junior Senator from Nevada sees it, the general is simply too popular a man for anyone in this administration to attack.

HANDICAPPING GENERAL MAC ARTHUR

I do not know how the United Nations thinks a man fights a war, or fights any fight. When he reached the thirty-eighth parallel they put their arms around him and held his arms down to his body for 10 days while the enemy recruited and dug in and got more munitions with which to fight him and to kill a few more American boys over there. We are now up against Manchuria. No one seems to know how far we are going. But we stop him from attacking behind the lines, where the munitions and troops are mobilized, and make him wait until they "hit the line," just as in a football game. "Don't start until the whistle blows."

Mr. President, if we do not look out, one of these days ways will be found to defeat even General MacArthur. No one can win a fight under such conditions.

Mr. President, coming back to the attack on Mr. Hoover, Mr. Max Lowenthal's book is a roundabout attack through an already discredited official or

exofficial, or a man who had worked for one of the committees.

SOKOLSKY'S OUTLINE OF LOWENTHAL

I have before me a very interesting article written by George Sokolsky, a man whom I greatly admire for his forthrightness of manner. The article appeared in the November 30 issue of the Washington Times-Herald. That was yesterday. In this article Mr. Sokolsky says:

Most of my colleagues have written about Max Lowenthal's book on J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI. Apparently they have read the book, but I must plead that I had other business on hand.

Anybody can be negative about such a job as J. Edgar Hoover does. Did Hoover catch the fellows who stole the ballot boxes in the Kansas City, Mo., election? No. He did not.

Was Harry Truman in Kansas City when the safe containing the ballot boxes was blown up? Yes, he was there. So.

That kind of argument can lead to nothing. A police department is to be judged by its general record, by the honesty and efficiency of its employees, and by its own adherence to the law.

The most provable criticism of the FBI is that while it collected evidence to convict spies, traitors, Communists and their fellow travelers, its accomplishments in this field have, on the whole, been unsatisfactory because on orders from the State Department and the Department of Justice, spies were not to be arrested.

In the evidence of Larry Kerley before the McCarran committee, the evidence shows that the FBI had Arthur Alexandrovich Adams, one of the worst spies Soviet Russia ever sent to this country, but the State Department safeguarded him from arrest.

Mr. President, those are strong words, and this man wrote them down. He is not immune.

Continuing:

In 1917, Lowenthal went on a secret foreign mission. This is what he says on the subject [in appearance before the House Committee on Un-American Activities—Editor]:

"It was a confidential mission that I don't care to go into. It was only for a short time, and I never discuss that kind of Government work with anybody."

You would imagine that in 1917 this secret mission was so terrific that it could only have been to Lenin or Trotsky or somebody like that, although I was in Petrograd in those days and do not recall Lowenthal, whose mission must have been too important even for history.

Max Lowenthal has held innumerable jobs with various branches of the Government from 1912 almost up to date. Some of them were of this character, to use his own words:

"In 1942 or 1943 there was some kind of problem, it is not quite clear in my mind; there was a war commission, I don't remember its name; it was headed by Mr. McNutt."

He is quoting from Mr. Lowenthal.

Mr. WHEELER—

That is Mr. Burt Wheeler, one of the keenest Senators who ever served on this floor, according to my book.

Mr. WHEELER. Paul McNutt?

This was from the cross examination. I continue:

Mr. WHEELER. Paul McNutt?

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Yes, Paul McNutt. I was sworn to assist them for a very temporary period on something or other, trying to straighten out some difficulties among some men who were not part of the Government.

He is still quoting from Mr. Lowenthal.

Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't remember these things too definitely, and anything any records would show that would correct me. I would accept those corrections.

Toward the end of 1943 or early 1944 I left that work. During all that period and since that period I have been consulted informally by various people in the Government, but so far as I can recollect at this moment, I don't think ever in any official capacity. There might be some, and I would be very glad to have those noted for the record.

Mr. President, I am quoting from an article written on the basis of a record, and reference is made to the man who wrote a book on the FBI. I continue:

It is a little difficult to believe that Mr. Lowenthal cannot remember what he did for Paul McNutt. It was not so long ago nor could it have been very important. Mr. Lowenthal's lapse of memory at this point is, to say the least, fascinating.

Mr. Lowenthal was asked who had recommended him for employment by the War Department. This is his reply:

"I couldn't say for certain. I was asked by a group of organizations whether I would permit my name to be submitted for recommendation by General Clay, and I agreed."

What are those organizations? He must know, but he does not say. No names of organizations. No names of individuals. It all hangs in the vacuum of secrecy and mystery.

At this point, Mr. President, let me say that I have the highest regard for Paul McNutt. I do not remember about this testimony, but it is mentioned here merely to show the type of this man and his memory. He had memory enough to write a 450-page book, but he did not have memory enough to know what important missions he was sent on by the War Department. I read further:

What are those organizations? He must know, but he does not say. No names of organizations. No names of individuals. It all hangs in the vacuum of secrecy and mystery.

Some of the pages of this hearing would interest a psychologist, who might write a doctor of philosophy thesis about them. Here is a man who started his career as secretary to Judge William Mack, a jurist of distinction who would not take on a dope.

I continue reading from the article by Mr. Sokolsky:

He goes through years of Government service and is associated with Senator Burton K. Wheeler on the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate.

Wheeler is an extraordinarily shrewd man. He would not hire a forgetful Jane. Yet, time after time, Mr. Lowenthal cannot remember dates, names, facts which no ordinary man could forget.

It is difficult to help wondering how a man, who forgets so much so easily, could remember so much about the FBI.

ATTACKS NOT ISOLATED

Mr. President, this attack on Government is not confined to isolated instances. If it were, it would be excusable. But here are two men. The first is Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, of the FBI. The second is General MacArthur, who, of the American people are convinced, is one of the greatest generals that the United States has ever produced. These two men are made the subject of isolated attacks. The attacks all tie in together in a deliberate pattern.

DESTROYING THE ECONOMIC SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. President, we have debated this issue a good many times on the floor of the Senate. Since 1934 the administration has deliberately entered into a line of action calculated to destroy the economic system of the United States, through deficit financing and the free trade program to divide the American markets with the nations of the world, removing all semblance of a floor under wages and investments. From the end of World War II we started giving away the strategic areas of the earth, needed to defend the United States of America. What happened at Yalta—Manchuria, Korea, Berlin? At Yalta we gave away Manchuria over the almost dead body of Chiang Kai-shek, without his knowledge, and then forced him to take it. We divided Korea into North Korea and South Korea, which undoubtedly hastened the advent of the present conflict. We gave way in Berlin, without retaining any means of ingress or egress. This made necessary heroic efforts to maintain a coal lift, which involved an expense of several hundred dollars a ton to haul coal into Berlin. There was nothing on the railroads, nothing on the highways, and nothing on the river except a few sentries who said, "You cannot pass."

REQUIRES A GREAT NATION TO TAKE THIS BEATING

Mr. President, it would take a great nation to stand up very much longer under an attack of this kind. It seems to me that it is time to stop such dangerous practices or at least expose them for what they are, namely, attacks on the great men who are still carrying their weight in the United States Army and in the greatest investigative body in the world.

ATTACKS DELIBERATE AND CALCULATED

In conclusion, let me tie these things together. They are not isolated things and cases. They come from separate sources. The attacks are deliberate and calculated.

The attack on General MacArthur comes from Europe, from the countries which are enjoying our bounty. They are on our payroll, just as are the FBI and the Secretary of State. The attacks on one of the greatest generals in the world are still being made. We hold him at the 38th parallel. We handicap him. We hold him on the Manchurian border and do not let him attack. We let the Reds murder our American boys.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 331) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the pending question. I desire the RECORD to clearly show my position with respect to the pending motion to consider the Alaska statehood bill. Of course we all recognize that the fate of the motion will carry with it the fate of the Hawaiian statehood bill. Frankly, I fully realize that so far as the event is concerned, I am unduly taking the time of the Senate. I realize that so far as

the pending motion is concerned, all it now needs is its obsequies. The end was a foregone conclusion when the motion was made. It has been perfectly clear for months that no vote would be had by the Eighty-first Congress on the merits of either of the statehood bills.

Before I discuss the bills and the present parliamentary situation, I wish to digress for a moment to express my own deep appreciation to the present occupant of the Chair [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for the yeoman service he has rendered as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in holding hearings on both bills, in reaching a conclusion by the committee on both bills, in reporting both bills to the Senate, and in endeavoring to get the Senate to give consideration to them. Being a member of the committee, I know the difficulties with which he as chairman was faced. Being a Member of the Senate, I know the difficulties with which he and I and all of us who believe that a measure of this kind is entitled to be heard on its merit have been faced since the bills were reported.

As I stand on my feet this afternoon, I am under no illusion as to what the end will be—the end has been.

However, Mr. President, other days will come. Somewhere, somehow, sometime the hopes and aspirations of the United States citizens who reside in the present Territory of Alaska, and the hopes, aspirations, and dreams of the citizens of the United States who reside in the Territory of Hawaii, must have recognition before this body.

Mr. President, the people of the United States have spoken on the question. Time after time the people of America have spoken in polls throughout the United States. The press of America has spoken. It is overwhelmingly in favor of the statehood measures. I realize that polls do not enjoy the same measure of sanctity they had before the Presidential elections of 1948. However, they are not wholly discredited.

I think at this time it would be well to invite the attention of the Senate to the result of such a poll which was taken by Dr. Gallup during the current year. It was taken after the 25th day of June, the date of the invasion of Korea. Thereafter, in the latter part of July, the result of the Gallup poll on statehood appeared in the papers of the country. The result was very carefully presented by Dr. Gallup. It was more than a showing of the result of the most recent poll. A comparative showing was made also.

Mr. President, I ask that a copy of the Gallup poll as it appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin on July 29, 1950, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GALLUP POLL ON STATEHOOD—TIDE OF PUBLIC SENTIMENT RUNS HIGH AS RESULT OF WAR IN KOREA

(By George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion)

One aftermath of the Korean War has been a sharp increase in public sentiment in favor of admitting Hawaii and Alaska into the Union as the forty-ninth and fiftieth States.

Shortly after President Truman announced the decision to defend Korea, the American Institute of Public Opinion put its Nation-wide corps of interviewers to work.

They sampled a carefully constructed cross section of the voting population in all areas of the continental United States on the question of statehood for the Hawaiian and Alaskan Territories—both strategic areas in any Pacific war.

It found a vote of 7 to 1 in favor of Hawaiian statehood, highest favorable sentiment in 9 years, and 10 to 1 in favor of Alaskan statehood.

Here is the trend of the vote on Hawaiian statehood:

"Would you favor or oppose having Hawaii admitted as a State in the Union?"

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	Percent	Percent
1941.....	48	23	29
1946.....	60	19	21
1949.....	58	12	30
February 1950.....	64	16	20
Today.....	76	10	14

The vote on Alaskan statehood follows:
"Would you favor or oppose having Alaska admitted as a State in the Union?"

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	Percent	Percent
1949.....	68	7	25
Today.....	81	8	11

STIRS RENEWED INTEREST

The Korean crisis, with the possibility that it may lead to war between the United States and Russia, stirred renewed interest in Congress in admitting Hawaii and Alaska into the Union. Both places were important military bases in the last war.

Hawaii itself has just drawn up a constitution looking toward statehood.

Admission of Hawaii would climax a long fight conducted in Washington on behalf of statehood by JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, has served as spearhead in the Senate for pro-statehood forces.

NO PARTISAN DIFFERENCES

As in previous surveys, today's study finds little difference of opinion by political parties on the statehood issue. Democratic and Republican voters join hands in voting for admission.

Here is the vote by party affiliation on the question of Hawaiian statehood:

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Democrats.....	77	9	14
Republicans.....	76	12	12
Independents.....	72	14	14

Mr. CORDON. I invite attention only to some extracts from the poll. Dr. Gallup says that when this poll was taken, after the crossing of the thirty-eighth parallel by the Korean Communists, the vote was 7 to 1 in favor of Hawaiian statehood, the highest favorable sentiment in 9 years, and 10 to 1 in favor of Alaskan statehood.

That was the result of a careful poll of public opinion taken by one of the outstanding men in his field. It was

taken after the beginning of the Korean aggression. Dr. Gallup says:

Here is the trend of the vote on Hawaiian statehood.

The question:

Would you favor or oppose having Hawaii admitted as a State in the Union?

In 1941, 48 percent voted yes; 23 percent voted no; 29 percent had no opinion.

In 1946, 60 percent voted yes; 19 percent voted no; 21 percent had no opinion.

In 1949, 58 percent voted yes; 12 percent voted no; 30 percent had no opinion.

In February of this year, 64 percent voted yes; 16 percent voted no; 20 percent had no opinion.

Today—this was after the Korean aggression had taken place—76 percent of those polled voted yes; 10 percent voted no; 14 percent had no opinion.

That was the result at the poll on Hawaiian statehood.

As to Alaskan statehood, the subject now under consideration—or at least it is pending at the moment and not yet buried—the question asked in the Gallup poll was: Would you favor or oppose having Alaska admitted as a State in the Union?

In 1949, 68 percent voted yes; 7 percent voted no; 25 percent had not made up their minds.

Today, after the beginning of the Korean aggression, 81 percent voted yes; 8 percent voted no; 11 percent had no opinion.

Mr. President, the results of the polls represent the thinking of the people of the United States. We who are honored with the confidence of these people, and who are sent here to represent them on the floor of the Senate, should give some thought to such an overwhelming expression of opinion on the part of the people we represent.

Mr. President, I have listened to the debates on the floor of the Senate. Those that I could not remain on the floor to hear I have read with care. I have particularly paid attention to the debate against the motion now pending. I desire to consider somewhat the contents of the statements made, the major aspects of them, so far as the points of opposition are concerned. But before I do that I should like to suggest my position on the statehood bill. I am discussing its merits. The debate has not been on a parliamentary motion to take up a bill. The debate has reflected the views of those who spoke as to whether they were for or against statehood for Alaska, so we might as well forget the fiction and go to the facts.

My position with reference to statehood for Alaska and statehood for Hawaii can be summed up thus: If taxation without representation was tyranny in 1776, it is tyranny today. If the right of people to govern themselves, to participate in their government, was so dear to those giants of old who gathered and promulgated and signed the Declaration of Independence, that they were willing to pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, in support of that proposition, it is just as dear today.

Mr. President, what we are considering is not a minor political question.

We are dealing with people. We are dealing with our own citizens. The white people of Alaska were made citizens by the treaty of annexation. The same is true of the population of Hawaii. The Territorial status of each guarantees to every individual in either Territory whose citizenship has been created under either of the organic acts or the treaties of annexation every constitutional right and immunity that is given to any citizen of the United States anywhere. They have every constitutional guaranty that I have or that the Presiding Officer has. They have every right I have or that he has except the right which brought our forebears into meeting when they promulgated the Declaration of Independence. They do not have the right to sit in the high councils of their government and have their representative there speak and work for them and for the Nation.

Mr. President, to me it is inconceivable that there could be any question in the mind of anyone as to the right of every American citizen to enjoy the full privileges of citizenship if in the area where he resides there are no more obstacles than are found in either of these two Territories. I can conceive of circumstances where citizenship might not, because of very real conditions, ripen into full-fledged voting and representation rights. I can understand that. But there is nothing here of that character.

The right of people to govern themselves and choose their representatives and have their voices heard through those representatives is the highest privilege and right that can come to them; and in this instance we are dealing with people, not with geographical areas; we are dealing with American citizens.

Mr. President, I wish that we could have had this bill before the Senate with some fair chance to go into it fully, to explore it to the utmost. I should like to take the time to traverse the statements made in the debate paragraph by paragraph and point by point, and indicate wherein it would seem to me that the speakers have not given the time which they should have given to the seriousness of this problem.

I have no criticism of any of my colleagues who take a view opposite to mine. I have been wrong many times. I think I am right now. But I do not criticize any for holding opposite views. I feel that there is a duty which devolves upon every Member of the Senate, however, to do whatever is humanly possible to help all who may be interested to gain a full understanding of the problems which confront us. I should like to see that done.

I shall not now take the time to do it, Mr. President, because I know it would be time wasted. I know that matters of desperate necessity will be before the Senate very shortly. I know that however much we may believe in the rights of our fellow citizens to 100-percent participation in our Government, nevertheless we would have to join others in setting aside consideration of the statehood bill in order to consider other

measures of tremendous importance made necessary from the world situation.

Mr. President, I also know that this is a rump session of the Senate. I know that there are Members of this body who feel just as deeply in opposition to these bills as I could feel in favor of them, or as even the citizens of Alaska and Hawaii feel. I know that those who have that deep opposition will—and they have frankly so stated—take advantage of every parliamentary situation in their favor to delay action or to defeat the motion.

Again, I do not criticize. I regret today more than ever since I have been in the Senate that we have not been able to do more to require that action be taken in this body when matters are presented to it of the gravity of the subject now under consideration. I am for the first time deeply doubtful as to whether we can go forward in an orderly fashion in the United States Senate with unlimited debate.

Mr. President, I have had great sympathy for my colleagues from the southern States. I know something of their problems. I was born in a southern State, of a southern mother. Frankly, I feel that my friends in the South have perhaps, as we say in the West, been too close to the trees for a long time fully to be able to evaluate the forest. I think perhaps prejudice has obscured their vision at times. I think perhaps their own people have gone further than they fully realize they have in a matter which very deeply concerns them. I can go a long way in support of deep-seated and honest convictions of my colleagues where the matters directly at hand are only concerned. But that is not the case here. Here we seek only to grant all the rights of citizenship to residents in two geographical areas which heretofore the Government of the United States has incorporated into this Union. We seek here only to carry out the basic tenets of the Government of the United States.

Indirectly, of course, that would mean two Senators from Alaska added to the United States Senate, and two Senators from Hawaii added to the United States Senate. But, Mr. President, there is none so wise as to be able at this time to know what views those new Members of this body would entertain on the so-called civil-rights question or any other question, nor how long they would entertain the views which they brought with them, nor what views their successors would have in the years to come. We do know that those Members of this body would be the choice of American citizens who would have the right to make the choice, and with respect to whom, Mr. President, in my view, we do not have the right to deny the right to make the choice.

Mr. President, as to the objections which have been made on the floor as to noncontiguity, it is a fact that Alaska and Hawaii are not contiguous Territories. If a Senator, after sound consideration, reaches the view that that is an insurmountable obstacle to statehood of the Territories, he has that right. But, at best, the arguments as to sparseness of population, lack of polit-

ical maturity, lack, as of the minute, of adequate financial resources for a new State, are weak. None of them, save that of noncontiguity, can apply to Hawaii. Hawaii is self-sufficient economically. Hawaii has had a long history of self-government patterned after the State governments of these United States. Alaska has a similar history, though it is not so long as that of Hawaii.

More reason could be advanced, let me in all frankness say, for opposition on the ground of lack of economic sufficiency in Alaska, than can be advanced with respect to Hawaii. But, Mr. President, as was said in the opening statement on this matter by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] who now presides over the Senate, Alaska is a treasure house of unknown potentialities, but, as now cataloged, her potentialities are adequate to guarantee all the assets needed for complete self-government. Those assets are not all immediately available and producing, but let me say that until statehood comes to Alaska, and its people have the right of citizens to set up and operate their own government and have their voices heard in the two Houses of Congress—until that takes place this vast storehouse will never be opened, and I think no one knows that better than the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Give to Alaska statehood, and Alaska will take care of the rest. I say that, Mr. President, as one who alone voted in the committee against a favorable report on the Alaska statehood bill. I believed then, as I believe now, that the provisions made in the bill are not adequate for complete self-sufficiency financially for a new State of Alaska. But I know that the potentialities are there, and I know that Congress, after a resurvey, can take care of that particular question. I also know that it never can take care of it until statehood comes to Alaska. That has been the history of our country.

Let us remember that this country today is operating under a completely different philosophy with reference to federally owned natural resources than existed when the other States came into the Union. When the State of Wyoming came into the Union, and before that, when the State of Oregon came into the Union, and before that, when the State of California came into the Union, and before that, when the State of Minnesota and the other States came into the Union—in those days every acre of the public domain was deemed to be held in trust by the Federal Government to be transmitted to the settlers in the new areas, and it was all open to them. It is no longer open. A new philosophy of ownership and management in the Federal Government has come about, and it has resulted in management by remote control and government by remote control, and it cannot help but result in that.

In that statement there is nothing critical of the departments who are doing the work connected with the Territories. I have criticized them when I thought they were wrong. I shall do so again

when I think they are wrong. But there is inherent in the concept of management on the basis of ownership the necessity of absentee landlordism when the seat of the Government is in Washington, D. C., and the lands are 1,000, 2,000, 3,000, 5,000 miles away. That is bound to result, and so long as it does result we will not have the kind of development that came to Wyoming, the kind of development that came to Oregon, the kind of development that came to California, the kind of development that came to all the other States. There must be created in Alaska the local government which can require, by virtue of its very necessities, the changing of the basic laws with reference to its assets and that, Mr. President, will be nothing new. That has happened time and time again in the history of the United States.

In my own State of Oregon we had special Federal laws to aid the settlers who came West into that unpeopled Territory. We had a special donation law by which a man and his wife might acquire 640 acres in the form of a donation from the Federal Government, 320 acres to each, and they might take it anywhere within the boundaries of the Territory without respect to legal subdivisions. That was a donation act passed especially for the people in the Oregon Territory. There was one for Arkansas, as I recall, the Swamp Land Act, a special concession to that area because of the peculiar conditions which existed in that area, where every acre of swampland became the property of the State, to enable the State to reclaim it and prepare it for the State's citizens and settlers. That was a special act to take care of a specific condition in order to encourage the development of that area. That Swamp Land Act was expended by successive acts time after time, and today embraces the State of Oregon, among others, and, I believe, the State of Wyoming.

Mr. President, that is nothing in the way of an obstacle to statehood for Alaska. Those matters can be handled certainly by Congress when it has behind it the experience of all the years which have gone by and which have witnessed the development of 2,000,000,000 acres of land within continental United States. All the people of Alaska need is an opportunity to prove that they can take care of themselves on a State basis. Let them have their State. Let them send their Representatives to the Senate and to the House of Representatives. Let us have before us the practical necessities of those people, and out of that vast treasure house we can meet those necessities in a practical manner after we can identify what is most needed.

Opposition has been heard here, Mr. President, because several thousand people are employed there, it is said, by the Federal Government. My answer is, "So what?"

In the first place, they are not employed by the Federal Government; they are employed by contractors who have contracts with the Federal Government. However, Mr. President, if we are to say that receiving Federal assistance is a bar to the exercise of all the rights and privileges of citizenship, what shall we say with respect to farm-support prices?

What shall we say with respect to national highways? What shall we say with respect to soil-conservation payments, and so forth—aids rendered by the Federal Government to the people all over these United States? Has that so corrupted them that they are not now entitled or able to discharge the duties of citizenship? The argument, Mr. President, falls of its own weight. It needs no answer.

Sparseness of population is advanced as an argument against statehood for Alaska. Mr. President, when the State of Oregon came into the Union, it had but 52,000 people, not 112,000, as is now the case in Alaska. The opponents of statehood for Alaska speak of the vast areas of Alaska that are unpeopled. Mr. President, I can take you down highways in my own State of Oregon and let you drive 115 miles without seeing a house, much less a service station, and I suspect that the same thing can be done in Wyoming and elsewhere on the Great Plateau. Certainly that argument has no validity.

Mr. President, there are arguments against the granting of statehood to Alaska, but they are not found in that sort of reasoning. I know they cannot be met in action on this floor at this time.

I could have hoped that after the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had rendered its report last June, we might have had a full and fair chance on the floor of the United States Senate to get these bills before the Senate and to determine whether majority rule should prevail. It would have been a trial by ordeal; that I recognize.

But, Mr. President, we are going to have to face that issue; and the sooner we do so the better for the United States. We have had other trials by ordeal. We are going to have to face it. Had the statehood measures been brought up—and, Mr. President, I feel that the majority party has to carry the load for that failure; I think those bills could have been brought up at the last session, with adequate time to determine, by trial by ordeal, if necessary, whether we can legislate on the basis of majority rule—the situation now would be different. However, we did not have that chance.

I feel very frankly that the making of the motion at this rump session represented little more than a gesture. I know that the President of the United States time after time has requested the Congress to act on this matter. I know that both parties, when asking for the people's votes, have pledged their support for statehood, and I know that the Democratic Party pledged its support for immediate statehood. Both parties have failed, Mr. President. Let us face it frankly.

There will be deep and bitter disappointment in the northland and in the islands of Hawaii. I can only say to those people, "Do not despair. Bring your cause again to the Congress, to both Houses of the Congress." I think I can say, "The committees of both Houses will help you get your bills again on the calendar."

Let us start a new session with new hope, and let us never cease trying.

There must be a day when the representatives of the people of this country will respond to the will of those whom they represent; and, Mr. President, on that day we will find two more stars in the flag of this Union.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of asking the very able senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORBON] if I may be associated with him in his excellent plea and his presentation of the compelling reasons why this measure should be given the right of legislative consideration, and also his reasoning as to why this measure and the one granting statehood to Hawaii should be enacted at this time. His presentation constitutes one of the most intelligent reasonings I have heard in the Senate Chamber why this measure constitutes sound proposed legislation and why we should act upon it now.

I wish to say, further, that the argument regarding the distance of Hawaii from the mainland of the United States and the distance of Alaska from the main body of the United States is not such that we should take it into consideration. The attempt in the course of the arguments to raise a fear that the distance is too great for adequate and proper protection, so far as the United States is concerned, in the case of these particular Territories is not sound. Time has changed the mode of transportation; and today it is not so hazardous or so time consuming to travel from the United States mainland to Hawaii as it was when our forefathers traveled from this Capital City to the then distant land of Oregon or even to the then distant land of Minnesota.

So, Mr. President, I say this is the time when the Congress should enact the proposed legislation which is before us, and should provide statehood not only for Alaska but also for Hawaii.

Again I wish to state to the very able senior Senator from Oregon that his reasoning in support of statehood for both of these Territories is most sound, and I ask that I may associate myself with him in his plea for statehood for them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take a very few minutes to associate myself with the exceedingly able argument which my senior colleague has made in support of statehood for Alaska and for Hawaii.

I have been a very long time coming to a final decision on this issue. During the last year I have read and studied extensively on this subject. It was not until shortly before the end of the recent session of Congress that I made my first public statement of position on this issue, when I announced that I had concluded that, on the facts and on the merits, statehood should be granted to both Hawaii and Alaska.

From October 15 to October 20, I traveled throughout Alaska with a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, headed by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT]. The other member of the subcommittee was the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALT-ONSTALL]. We covered the following major points in Alaska, which I mention

now because I wish to use the observations I made during that inspection trip as a basis for certain conclusions which I wish to draw in support of statehood for Alaska: We arrived in Alaska, at Anchorage; we traveled from Anchorage to Nome; from Nome to Fairbanks, and on to Eilson Field, to Whittier, to Seward, to Juneau, to Annette, to Ketchikan, and back to the States.

At all those points we conducted a series of public hearings, Mr. President, on the basic question of Alaskan defenses; but in the course of that investigation in Alaska we had ample opportunity to study the Alaskan statehood problem and to weigh the points of view which were presented to us by the people in that Territory.

I wish to make very clear, Mr. President, that we did not conduct any hearings on the question of Alaska statehood. Such observations respecting statehood for Alaska as any member of that subcommittee made, he made on his personal and independent behalf.

This afternoon I propose to speak only for the junior Senator from Oregon, as a member of that subcommittee. I wish to say that the greatest human drama I have ever observed, I observed in Nome, Alaska, when on October 18, I believe it was, we conducted a public hearing in the courthouse, where we listened to witnesses testify in behalf of some 150 fellow American citizens, residents of the Seward Peninsula. We observed them exercise one of the greatest of all the freedoms incident to being an American, namely, the freedom to petition their Government for the redress of what they consider to be a wrong.

In testimony ably prepared, they presented to our committee the evidence on which they based their petition for more adequate defense, not for themselves alone, not for Nome alone, but for the entire Seward Peninsula. Two of those witnesses will always remain very vivid in my memory, Mr. President; one of them, a Mr. A. Polet, who has spent 51 years in Nome. He has raised his family there, presently lives with his grandchildren in Nome. He has been a past president of various civic clubs and is presently secretary of the Nome Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Polet is one of the leading merchants of the Seward Peninsula, beloved by all the residents of that area, including the native Eskimos. The other witness I wish to especially mention is a Mr. Jones, who has been in Nome for 53 years, and who for many years was a member of the Senate of the Territory of Alaska. These witnesses presented to us, as our committee report I am sure will eventually show, convincing evidence that the resources of the Seward Peninsula are of such vital importance to the security of America that they must never be allowed to fall into the hands of Soviet Russia. As we sat in the courthouse listening to the testimony presented in the course of the hearing, we were less than 10 minutes by jet plane from one of the greatest concentrations of air power ever assembled by any nation—the air power of Soviet Russia assembled on Siberian soil. I repeat that this powerful concentration of Russian air

might is a little less than 10 minutes by jet plane from Nome, Alaska. Of course, we were a shorter time than that from Big Diomedé, which is well known to be one of the great military installations of Soviet Russia. Figuratively, it is just a stone's throw from Nome. It is also well known, Mr. President, if one is in Alaska—and the Delegate from Alaska in the House of Representatives is in the Senate Chamber at this moment, who could verify what I say—that our planes do not get near Big Diomedé, although it is such a short distance from American shores. They do not approach Big Diomedé because of the military installations of Russia on Big Diomedé.

As we looked out of the window of that courthouse onto Marks Field, which was one of the great air bases of America during World War II, what did we see? We saw a field which to all intents and purposes has been dismantled—stark, ghostly evidence of one of the great mistakes of America since World War II, as far as its demobilization and disarmament program is concerned. I would point out this afternoon that for a long time following the close of World War II we were actually engaging, senselessly in my opinion, in a disarmament program in America as well as a demobilization program. Marks Field stands as a stark reality of that fact.

These witnesses, Mr. President, testified for defense of the Seward Peninsula, not for themselves alone, as I say, not for Nome alone, but for the Seward Peninsula, because the resources of the Seward Peninsula are vital to the security of every American living in continental United States. And so, as my able colleague has pointed out in his excellent speech here today, we are dealing with a Territory which is a rich storehouse of natural resources vital to our security. As he further pointed out, the people who live in the Territory where these resources are located most certainly are entitled to adequate defense, and they are entitled to a voice in American governmental policies, backed up by voting representation.

In fact, for a long time one of the cardinal principles that we have enunciated in our relations with foreign peoples has been the principle of supporting self-determination. But I want to say we are guilty of not giving to our fellow Americans the right to exercise self-determination in Alaska, because that right cannot be exercised unless the right of self-government goes along with it. Therefore, the first major point I wish to make in support of my conclusion that Alaska—and it is equally applicable to Hawaii—should be given statehood, is that I believe that from the standpoint of living up to the principle of self-determination American citizens living in Alaska are entitled to self-government.

Mr. President, I would point out that we have tried to make clear throughout our history that we do not look with favor upon a policy of colonialism, because a policy of colonialism inevitably, as history shows, is inclined to lead to taking advantage of the subjects of the colony. It is inclined to lead to a pattern of exploitation of people who are

not given a voting voice in self-government.

One cannot travel through Alaska, one cannot talk to the many people with whom we talked in our recent trip through Alaska without recognizing that Alaska suffers from the great evil of absentee ownership. Absentee ownership and the evils that inevitably go along with it can thrive best when self-government is denied. Self-government is necessary to check the evils of absentee ownership; and if self-government, which would go along with statehood existed in Alaska, I think there would be discovered within a very few years thereafter a great improvement in Alaska in connection with some of the problems which have been mentioned in this debate by the opponents of statehood. This is generally recognized throughout Alaska, as one talks to the people: they feel that much of their opposition is coming from great financial powers outside Alaska, with tremendous investments within Alaska, who are conducting a program of absentee ownership. I think that is also true to a lesser degree in regard to some of the problems of Hawaii.

The next point that I want to emphasize in this argument for statehood for Alaska and for Hawaii is that I believe we have an opportunity here again to demonstrate to the world that we do not believe in perpetuating a policy of colonialism upon any people when they reach the point in their territorial development where it is safe and proper to relieve them of that colonial policy. I say, Mr. President, that both Hawaii and Alaska have reached that point, and we are called upon, it seems to me, before the bar of public opinion of the world, to practice this great profession of ours that we will not keep a people under colonial control beyond the time that we can be of the greatest assistance to them throughout a colonial policy. We have always proclaimed to the world that we will give the people of an American colony or territory complete self-government as soon as they have reached that territorial development which makes perfectly clear that they are ready to govern themselves. I submit, as my able colleague has so well pointed out this afternoon, that the people of Alaska and of Hawaii have reached that point of territorial development, and that for us longer to keep them under territorial control will, in the eyes of millions of people in the world, make us guilty of perpetuating a policy of colonialism upon a people who are ready to be freed of colonialism.

Thus, I wish to stress that statehood for Alaska and for Hawaii would have tremendous value to the United States in international recognition of our good faith of living up to the principle of self-determination, as well as in demonstrating in practice as in professing that we do not believe in denying self-government to people who are ready for it.

As my colleague has pointed out, I know the argument is made that there is a sparse population in Alaska. Irrespective of which population figure is selected, whether it is the lower figure which I have heard mentioned in this

debate, of 112,000, or the figure of 132,000, which I heard throughout Alaska as I talked to the people on my recent trip there, I believe either figure compares well with the total population in some of our present States at the time they were admitted into the Union, including, for example, my own State. It is an adequate population. As my senior colleague mentioned, to point out that there is a concentration of population in only a few areas of Alaska as ground for denying statehood at this time is a very specious and fallacious argument. I say that because I believe if Alaska were granted statehood and given the right to free herself from some of the evils of absentee ownership, with the resulting improvements which would flow from the granting of statehood, such as more adequate transportation and highway system, the population of Alaska would increase rather rapidly. Such has been our experience in connection with other sparsely populated areas which in time past have been granted statehood.

Mr. President, the next argument I wish to make in support of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is the sound argument of fairness to our fellow citizens.

I believe ordinary fairness and ordinary decent dealing with fellow Americans call for the granting of statehood to Alaska and Hawaii at this time. I do not think it is fair and square to deny to fellow American citizens the right of self-government when they can make as strong a case for self-government as the people of Alaska and Hawaii have made.

I do not care to dwell this afternoon on what motives may be present in the Senate for the parliamentary barricade which has been thrown up in order to prevent a vote upon the two statehood bills in this short session of Congress. I regret what I believe to be those motives. I am a realist, and I have been a realist all along on the whole question of unlimited debate in the Senate. I am realistic enough to know that uncontrolled, unlimited debate in the Senate is the barrier which will prevent a vote on the pending question in this short session of Congress. However, I am hoping that the sense of fair play, which characterizes the inner man of every one of my colleagues in the Senate who is using a parliamentary barricade to prevent a vote on the pending question in this short session of Congress will cause everyone of them to agree that we should come to a vote on it in the next session of Congress which will start in January, after full and fair debate on the merits of the issue. If the experience we are having on this question in the short session of Congress will serve to speed up the opportunity in the next session of Congress to thrash out the question I think some good purpose will be served by the debate in which we are presently engaged.

I am still of the opinion that in view of the complex problems which face our Government in the present era we cannot continue to maintain the present protections which surround our policy of unlimited debate in the Senate. I believe the problems which confront us will be too critical and time too im-

portant to permit of absolute unlimited debate.

As was pointed out on the floor of the Senate yesterday afternoon, when we sought to get some action on the railway labor bill, the situation has come to the point where it is difficult to imagine any issue, certainly in the field of social and economic legislation, which could come before the Senate to which a Senator could not attach an amendment that would be offensive to a Senator who does not share the point of view of the junior Senator from Oregon on the subject of civil rights, for example.

I believe that sooner or later—and I believe it will be sooner than most people realize—we shall have to frankly face the question of cloture, and shall have to reexamine it, as I believe we should reexamine all policies of our Government, as they relate to both domestic and foreign issues, to the end of trying to settle the issues upon the facts as we find them to be.

I believe the debate on Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood will make clear to the American people, as it has been made clear heretofore, that the rules of the Senate with regard to cloture will have to be modified in the next session of Congress, so that a strong majority view in the Senate can prevail on any issue. Of course, I am still of the opinion that the type of cloture rule similar to the majority-vote rule which I have fought for ever since I have been a Member of the Senate is the soundest of the solutions which have been suggested. Certainly some solution sounder than the present rule will have to be adopted if we are to avoid, as I think we must avoid, the type of parliamentary barrier which prevents what I am satisfied is a strong majority in the Senate from taking action on the merits of an issue such as the one presently before the Senate.

Mr. President, I am satisfied that if we could get a vote on the merits of the question of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, statehood would be granted to both Territories, so far as Senate approval was concerned, at least, by a substantial majority of this body.

I believe we weaken democracy, injure self-government, and create a great deal of confusion in the minds of the American people by preventing majority rule from prevailing in the Senate by the adoption of parliamentary tactics which deny a vote on the merits of a question.

Mr. President, I close by saying that, in my opinion, the over-all and controlling reason for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is that I believe granting statehood is vital to the security and defense of my country. I speak now in my individual capacity as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services which investigated and inspected the defenses of Alaska. It is my personal conclusion that the defenses would never have reached the weakened condition into which they were permitted to get following World War II if the Territory of Alaska had had voting representation in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. I am convinced that if the people of Alaska had been given the precious freedom of self-gov-

ernment which we in the States enjoy, their elected representatives would have brought to the two Houses of Congress the evidence and arguments which would have prevented Congress from figuratively sticking its head in the sand while the great defenses of Alaska were permitted to become so weakened following World War II that up to a few months ago some of them could be described as having been dismantled.

Mr. President, I wish to say that, in my opinion, the security and the welfare of 160,000,000 American citizens have been jeopardized by the weakening of the defenses of Alaska. What has happened in Alaska during the last year has been nothing short of miraculous, when at long last we became aware of the weakened condition of the defenses and again moved in with a program of strengthening the defenses of Alaska.

I am not privileged, and it would not be proper for me, to discuss on the floor of the Senate this afternoon the information which our subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee gathered in regard not only to the present status of Alaskan defenses, but as to what has been done in Alaska during the last 10- or 11-month period in strengthening those defenses. I do want to say to the American people here this afternoon that I think each one of them should offer up a prayer to Almighty God for the heroic service that is being rendered in Alaska right now, this hour, by thousands of members of our armed services, under living and service conditions which not a single Member of this body would be proud of if he had a chance to observe those conditions.

We are greatly indebted to those men in the armed services in Alaska who stand ready at a moment's notice to make the great sacrifice which will be theirs the moment the Russian air force moves off of Siberia toward the United States. In the same spirit we should offer up a fervent prayer tonight to Almighty God for the great service and heroic sacrifices which thousands upon thousands of American boys are making this very hour in Korea, sacrifices which in my opinion needed not to be as great as they are if we, the people of the United States, had, since World War II followed a realistic course in regard to America's defenses, and if we had done the things in the Congress of the United States necessary to get this country of ours so strong that Stalin would always have understood that he had everything to lose and nothing to gain from conducting the type of aggressive foreign policy which has characterized him since the end of World War II. Likewise the officials in the executive branch of the Government have failed to adopt a realistic program with respect to the defense needs of America.

Oh, how shortsighted we have been. It was known—no Member of Congress can deny the fact, no Member of the administration can deny the fact—that as we proceeded with a program of demobilization and disarmament, as we economized at the expense of the adequate defense of America, Russia was devoting her major economy and effort to the building up of her armed forces.

Now at long last we come to face the stark, cold reality that if the all-out war should come as soon as tomorrow, our sacrifices would be tremendous, and far in excess of what they needed to be had we not followed what I consider was a shortsighted policy of inadequate defense since the close of World War II.

Mr. President, I speak not from hindsight, because as a member of the Armed Services Committee, along with my colleagues on that committee, I assert that committee has been strong for more adequate defense throughout the whole period of demobilization and disarmament. As a member of that committee, I say that we as a Congress must proceed now to do everything that must be done in order to strengthen the defenses of this country. In my opinion, we must proceed with an all-out, full-scale military and economic mobilization program, and we must stop the ghastly mistakes of vacillation and delay in facing the realities of the present situation.

We in the Congress have something to answer for, in my opinion, in regard to this crisis. I think we wasted precious time last July, August, and September in respect to a great many of the defense matters, because I think it was as clear then as it is now that the crisis was an exceedingly serious one. We must find out now whether or not Russia intends war or peace.

Mr. President, our leaders must stop keeping some kind of a hood tied over their eyes through which they see very dimly the realities of the world picture. As a matter of fact we are at war now, and have been for months, because Russia's policies for months in the field of international relations toward the United States have not been the policies of a friendly nation. She has followed, I think quite openly, a course of action which can receive no other adequate description than as a course of action of carrying on a form of armed conflict against us by backing up various satellite countries which have carried on direct action against us. Russia herself has been guilty not only of supplying them with the materials, with the finances, and the military advice, and sometimes leadership, for their course of armed action, but also in the United Nations, both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly, she has followed a course of action which has made very clear time and time again that she has not been a friendly nation toward us, but one really acting in a hostile manner. The ugly fact is that Russia has been carrying on a type of war against us for many months.

Mr. President, that has been my position in this matter for months and months, and as a member of the Armed Services Committee I have never failed to give support to programs which sought to strengthen the security of our country.

In pleading this afternoon for Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood I wish to say that in my judgment statehood for those Territories will strengthen America's defenses. They will strengthen America's defenses in a variety of ways. They will strengthen America's defenses insofar as

morale in those two Territories is concerned. They will strengthen the defenses in that the strength that will flow from statehood will result in some very valuable cooperative action on the part of those two Territories in the whole matter of civilian defense, as well as military defense itself.

Mr. President, I think they will strengthen the security of America because their recognition as States will again demonstrate to the world that we intend to put into practice the principles of the United Nations Charter, which we solemnly adopted in this body by ratification in 1945.

So, Mr. President, I look upon the bills for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii as great symbols of the intention of the Congress of the United States to meet, without any reservations whatsoever, what I consider to be our solemn obligation in this hour of crisis to do everything that is necessary to help strengthen the security of all the people of the United States.

For these main reasons I am pleased to place myself on public record here this afternoon in support of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, and as pleading for an early vote on the merits of the issue.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I realize it is impossible for me to add anything to the forceful and impressive arguments which have already been made in behalf of statehood for Alaska. I believe that about everything that has been said in the arguments advanced against the admission of Alaska was said against the admission of Montana into the Union. Montana was admitted to the Union on November 8, 1889. I know that many people at that time thought that about all Montana had was a great many Indians and snow-covered mountains. We did have many Indians and we did have snow covered mountains. But we had a few people who had migrated into that Territory, who had built their homes there, were rearing families, and intended to proceed to develop the country for their children and children's children.

Three years ago I was one of several members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who visited Alaska. I then discovered that Alaska had snow-covered mountains and also had many Indians, and Eskimos as well. We do not happen to have Eskimos in Montana. We found likewise a people in Alaska who had migrated there, people with courage, with ambition, with vision, who were building homes, and rearing families, and who intended to stay in Alaska if possible.

We found that many people from my own State had gone to Alaska. I suppose life in Montana had become too easy for them, so they wanted to go to Alaska to satisfy the old pioneering spirit. They were doing good work there. But back in their minds they hoped for the time when eventually Alaska would become a State. That has been in the minds of the people there for years and years and years. I was surprised to meet as many persons as I did who thought it was essential that Alaska be admitted to the Union, with all the rights of statehood.

Mr. President, I talked to a great many GI's who had been in Alaska during World War II, and who had returned there, bringing their brides with them, and were attempting to make a home there and provide for themselves a livelihood. Many of them told me, however, "We do not expect to stay here all our lives." I asked, "Why?" They said, "This is a Territory. We simply do not like to raise our children to maturity in a Territory. It is all right for them to stay here for a while, but after a bit they will want to go to school, and we will have to make arrangements to go back to the States. Now, if you Members of Congress would give us statehood we think we would be willing to stay here and make it our home for the future. We can develop this country just as those in the West have developed their States, which at the time of statehood were sparsely settled." A great many of them felt that it would mean much to them and to their children if they could say they were citizens of the State of Alaska rather than of the Territory of Alaska. That made a deep impression upon us.

Mr. President, I met in Alaska the finest kind of people I have met anywhere in the world. They are friendly, they are generous, they are hard-working, and they are most forward-looking.

I do not believe we need to worry about whether the resources of Alaska are sufficient to support statehood. In my opinion, Alaska has practically everything that any other State of the Union has except agriculture, and Alaska is developing agriculturally. Under modern methods of using various kinds of soils under differing climatic conditions, I believe eventually Alaska will have a pretty good agriculture, and will develop agriculturally as well as in other ways.

I believe Alaska has more resources than most of the other States of the Union have at the present time. The Senator from Oregon mentioned the natural resources of Alaska. Natural resources abound in Alaska. Nearly every kind of mineral that can be imagined is hidden away in the mountains and the hills and the valleys of Alaska.

Mr. President, I am happy that years ago someone had the foresight to secure Alaska as a Territory for the United States. In the face of the world situation as it is, and knowing of all the strategic materials we need to protect ourselves in this modern age, I am glad that we have the Territory of Alaska under our control.

In view of the fact that the people of that Territory have been promised statehood for so many years, and have been on trial for so many years, since at least a majority of them have worked earnestly and continuously for advancement to statehood, and in view of the fact that the Alaska statehood bill has already been passed by the House twice, that we have for 2 years held long and tedious public hearings on the subject, and that the Senate committee has seen fit to advance it to the floor of the Senate, I had hoped that we could have

the bill brought before the Senate, at least so a vote could be had on it, in order to let the people of Alaska see the real picture.

Mr. President, when I was in Alaska 3 years ago I told the people there that I honestly thought statehood legislation could be put through the Congress of the United States. They wanted to know why. I said, "Because in my opinion you occupy the most strategic place on the face of the globe. From a military standpoint all eyes are going to be turned on Alaska in the next few years. I think we are going to recognize your strategic position and realize that we can do a better job if Alaska is a State of the Union, rather than merely a Territory."

Mr. President, I merely wish to say this evening that I honestly believe that Alaska is the key to the proper defense of the North American continent, that it is the key spot on the map where will be determined in the future whether we shall have world peace or not.

Mr. President, now all our eyes are turned on Korea. That is all very well. Korea, however, is not the key to Asia. Korea is not the key to the peace of the world. I say in all sincerity and honesty that I believe Alaska, our own Territory, which belongs to the United States, is the key. I agree with the Senator from Oregon that we had better be spending our time and our money in making plans for any eventuality, because in my opinion Alaska is the pinnacle of the world.

Senators may say, as I have heard it said here, "Well, what if it is? We will defend Alaska." Of course, we are going to defend Alaska whether it is a Territory or a State. It belongs to us. The people of Alaska are a part of us, even though they live in a Territory, and even though they cannot vote for national officers, and even though they do not have representation in Congress, except through one delegate, whom they elect, but who has no vote in Congress.

It is no secret that Russia is putting forth propaganda that the United States bought Alaska years ago too cheaply, and that rightfully and justly Alaska should belong to Russia. Mr. President, the good people of Alaska hear those stories and are worried by them. Inasmuch as Alaska now is merely a Territory, some of her people wonder whether perhaps if the going became tough, the United States would move out and would let them go, rather than put up a fierce battle and possibly involve the entire world.

Mr. President, I say to you that we need to do everything we possibly can to build up the morale of the good citizens who live in Alaska. We should make them understand that they are full-fledged American citizens, with all the rights, privileges, and protections of American citizens, and that they are supported by the determination of a great Government to see that they are protected. That will help their morale; it will give them additional courage; and they, in turn, will give greater morale to the thousands of our citizens who, as

members of the Armed Forces, have to be stationed in Alaska.

Mr. President, the towns in Alaska and the homes in Alaska remind me a great deal of towns and cities and homes in my own State of Montana. Naturally, the houses in Alaska have to be built well in order to withstand the cold, but they look very much like houses in any other modern city or town. Alaska in the total respect is not the wilderness it is sometimes portrayed to be.

Alaska possesses some of the most beautiful scenery in the world. If we admit Alaska to the Union as a full-fledged State I think that eventually there will be a paved highway between this country, across Canada, to Alaska; and every summer many of our citizens will wish to travel there, instead of going to Europe, South America, or some other foreign land. I do not see how anyone could find in Switzerland or in any other foreign country any sights more beautiful than those which can be found in Alaska.

Mr. President, a large delegation of Alaskans came to Washington and appeared before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and we went into every detail in regard to what will be involved if Alaska is granted statehood. I know that there are arguments in opposition; but the splendid group of people who came here last winter and who were honest and sincere had given the problem much serious consideration. They are united in believing that Alaska, if admitted to the Union as a State, will be able to finance herself and will be able to overcome all obstacles. They recognize that there are certain obstacles to be overcome if Alaska is granted statehood; but they wish to try, they wish to go forward, they wish to accept the challenge and the responsibility. They are certain they can manage it. I believe they can; and I believe they will if they are granted the opportunity to do so.

Mr. President, I am sorry that certain aspects of the matter have developed in the course of the argument and the effort to bring this bill before the Senate for consideration. In that connection I am not blaming anyone. I know how certain Senators feel about the balance of power and other questions. However, I do not think we need worry about that; I think all those matters can be taken care of. I believe that any Senators or Members of the House of Representatives who might be elected from Alaska and sent to the United States Congress would be fair and open-minded, and would not take undue advantage of anyone. I am not fearful of that situation. Knowing the people of Alaska as I believe I do, I have confidence that they would elect as representatives of the State of Alaska Senators and Representatives who would be fair, open-minded, and sound on all questions of national interest.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I have not changed my mind since I was in Alaska 3 years ago, when I promised those good people that I would support their statehood bill; and I am supporting it now.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am about to move a recess, but before doing so, I desire to express my appreciation of the notable contributions which have been made this afternoon to the arguments in support of the statehood bills by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]; his colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]; and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], who has just taken his seat.

The senior Senator from Oregon spoke knowingly and feelingly of taxation without representation as it applies to the people of these Territories. There has just come to my knowledge an incident which shows that it is far more than taxation without representation; it is military service, it is conscription, without representation.

Early this week there appeared at the office of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a delegation of 28 citizens of Hawaii, who came to the continental United States and to the Capitol of the Nation in the fond hope that before this session had adjourned, they would be able to witness the passage by the Senate of the bill extending statehood to the Territory of Hawaii. Among that group was a native Hawaiian, Col. Peter Pakele, who served as a second lieutenant in World War I; who was lieutenant colonel of the Hawaii National Guard at the outbreak of World War II; who became Provost Marshal of Hawaii on December 7, 1941, the day of the attack on Pearl Harbor; and who thereafter became commanding officer of the Hawaiian Home Guard. Colonel Pakele is leaving Washington tomorrow, to go to Santa Clara University, in California, to see his son, also a native Hawaiian, before the latter is inducted under the draft law of the United States to serve in the Army of the United States, possibly on the Korean peninsula. The father, who has served his country, and the son, who is about to serve his country also in the military service, stand in grave danger of not receiving news from Washington that statehood will be extended to the Territory in which they live, but of learning that they will continue to have no voice in the action of Congress in levying taxes upon their incomes and upon their property and in levying the draft upon their sons.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, December 4, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 1 (legislative day of November 27), 1950:

DIRECTOR OF PRICE STABILIZATION

Michael V. Di Salle, of Ohio, to be Director of Price Stabilization.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Holmes Baldrige, of Oklahoma, to be an Assistant Attorney General to fill an existing vacancy.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Edwin D. Foster, Supply Corps, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

DECEMBER 1, 1950.

I hereby designate Hon. JERE COOPER to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, who hast been our strength in ages past and art our only hope for years to come, we are again lifting our hearts in unison beseeching Thee for wisdom and guidance as we face difficult tasks and responsibilities in this needy and war-torn world.

We pray that Thou wilt bless all councils and assemblies and conferences which are seeking to promote the spirit of amity and concord among the nations of the earth. May the deliberations and decisions of the leaders and representatives of our own beloved country help to establish a commonwealth of freedom, strong and great in the fear of God, loving righteousness and walking in the ways of peace.

Inspire rulers and people everywhere with a longing to solve the problems of human relationship upon the high level of a hallowed respect for the sanctity of human rights and liberties and a Christ-like reverence for the worth and dignity of the soul of man created in Thine own image and destined for immortal life.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INFLATION

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the greatest enemy of this country, the greatest threat to our security and survival, is not communism; it is inflation. Increased wages and increased prices continue to follow each other in a vicious circle, and the American dollar continues to shrink. If our economy collapses under this assault, as it may well do, then we become an easy prey to barbarism, and our children will become slaves

of Communist tyranny. We talk of the terror of the atom bomb; a greater danger is that we will be atomized by inflation. The impelling question we must now answer is: Shall we permit the life savings of our people to be burned up in the raging fires of uncontrolled inflation?

Today's press carries the story that our gigantic steel industry is granting a substantial wage increase to its employees. No effort is being made to stop other big industries from doing the same thing. Each group in this country wants the other group to hold the line while they get an unfair cut from our inflated economic melon.

The administration has the power to hold the wage-price line. If the administration will not act now, this Congress, before adjourning, should enact mandatory legislation against further wage and price increases. Surely we are not so lacking in courage or intelligence as to permit this gruesome game of self-destruction to go on unimpeded.

STALIN'S REPRESENTATIVE: MAX LOWENTHAL

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, back on September 1, I made a speech on the floor exposing the many Communist connections of one Max Lowenthal. Since then Lowenthal's smear book on the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been published and there has been much discussion of the book on the floor of this House.

I now wish to bring to the attention of the Members the fact that Lowenthal's book has finally received the acclaim it richly deserves. Yesterday's issue of the Daily Worker, the official organ of the Communist Party in this country, made the following statement:

The Gestapo-like menace of the FBI to the democratic freedom of all Americans has been too well documented in the current book on the FBI by Max Lowenthal.

That comment makes clear, if there had ever been any doubt, that Lowenthal's book is serving the cause of Moscow. Stalin must be well pleased with Lowenthal.

ARMING OUR ENEMIES TO BE PAID FOR WITH THE BLOOD OF OUR BOYS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if this administration is incapable of learning from experience. It would seem so to those of us who protested against the arming of Japan with our scrap iron, copper, tin, oil, airplane engines, ships, and tanks. There could have been no war in the Pacific had it not

been for the arming of the enemy. Those of our boys who are now dead would probably be living normal, happy lives had the United States not armed Japan. Now the ghastly tragedy is being repeated in Korea. Russia is being armed from our own arsenals. Our boys are paying a ghastly price for the irresponsibility of the Truman administration, the same as our boys did when we armed Japan. Not alone this, but our allies are arming our enemies. It is hopeless for a minority to get results by protesting, but the awakening conscience of the American people will have to take a stand on this issue, otherwise this administration will continue to arm our enemies and thus contribute to the destruction of our fine young men.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article published in the Reader's Digest of November 1950, entitled "When Are We Going To Stop Helping Russia Arm?"

WHEN ARE WE GOING TO STOP HELPING RUSSIA ARM?—TOO MUCH STRATEGIC MATERIAL IS GOING LEGALLY FROM WESTERN EUROPE AND ILLEGALLY FROM THE UNITED STATES

(By O. K. Armstrong and Frederic Sondern, Jr.)

During 1950 the merchants and industries of Western Europe will have contributed, legally, almost a billion dollars' worth of machinery and materials to the war potential of the Soviet Union and its satellites. Factories in the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Switzerland, and even Western Germany—many of which have been rebuilt or retooled with the help of ECA dollars—continue to provide ball bearings, lathes, drill presses, special steels, with which the plants of Magnitogorsk and Kuibyshev turn out guns, tanks, and warplanes.

To this flood of material going to Russia legally there will have been added much more which is smuggled across borders. Some of it comes from the United States.

When it became apparent 3 years ago that the Soviet leaders would not cooperate to establish world peace, Congress remembered the lessons we learned from our shipments of scrap iron to Japan and our foolhardy trade with Nazi Germany before Pearl Harbor. It took steps to prevent a repetition of such mistakes.

Shipment of all arms and ammunition aboard was prohibited except under specific license by the State Department. Exports of potential war materials, which were named, would require licenses from the Department of Commerce. Abroad, the Economic Cooperation Administration was ordered to stop delivery of Marshall plan goods to any country which was reshipping them to Communist territory. The use of ECA machinery and materials to produce goods for export to the east was also prohibited. In a long series of negotiations, the State Department tried to get the Western European governments to agree to place an embargo similar to the American one on shipments to Communist areas.

The promises from the European capitals receiving ECA aid were many; but they have not been well kept. Almost all the Western European nations maintain trade agreements with Russia and its satellite states. They have been accustomed to trading with these countries for many years, and the imports they receive from the east are important to them. Also, their definitions of potential war materials have differed from ours. Hence, this year Britain alone will have dispatched to Russia and Eastern Europe some \$120,000,000 worth of goods, much of which Washington considers of high strategic value. Sweden, the Netherlands, France, Italy, Belgium, and Switzerland follow close behind.

This open trade is officially sanctioned by treaties and duly reported to the United States. The Russians have another, clandestine, source of supply. To circumvent American export and ECA transshipment controls, Soviet agents use bribery and even murder.

On the morning of October 31, 1948, the body of Irving Ross, an official of our ECA headquarters in Austria, was found in a field on the outskirts of Vienna. He had been brutally murdered, his head smashed to a pulp. Nearby lay the freshly bloodied and shattered butt plates of a Russian machine pistol.

On the previous evening, as the United States provost marshal's investigation finally revealed, Ross was driving home an acquaintance who lived in the Russian sector of the city when a jeep suddenly forced him to the curb. Four men piled out, wrenched open the doors, and crowded into the car. "That way, very fast," barked one of them, pointing with his pistol. As Ross, with a gun muzzle at his neck, sped down the Triesterstrasse his companion was hurled from the car. Our provost, blocked at every turn by suddenly blind and deaf Soviet policemen, could get no further with finding the killers. But Washington well knew the cause of the murder.

Ross had been investigating the activities of certain Western European firms who were shipping goods exported to them under the Marshall plan to destinations behind the iron curtain. He was a legitimate diplomatic representative and no cloak-and-dagger spy, but he had stumbled on an important section of the Russian network of buyers who operate in Europe to funnel strategically valuable materials into Russian industry. He was getting to know, by patient research, the names, methods and organization of the key men in Vienna—Russia's most important commercial contact point with the west. The Soviet's Vienna bureau in charge of these matters evidently decided that such knowledge if transmitted to Washington might prove embarrassing. Russian agents play rough with people—diplomats or not—who get too close to their vital secrets.

The west-east smuggling operation is probably the biggest in the history of this ancient business. The United States High Commission in Germany estimates that more than \$200,000,000 worth of highly critical products have found their way illegally into Communist territory every year for the past 4 years, from Western Germany alone. The hopelessly understaffed Western German customs and frontier guard, which can barely manage to inspect one out of every 50 freight cars and every tenth truck crossing into Eastern Germany, is no match for the well-organized, Soviet-financed gangs which run this lucrative and fantastic business.

One such gang, stopped by the German police recently after many months of careful detective work, is a good example of the racketeering organizations at work all over Europe. This particular combine, with headquarters in Frankfurt, branch offices in Vienna and Milan, and correspondents in Bern, Paris, Stockholm, London, and New York, was headed by four men: a German, a Hungarian, an Englishman, and a Swede. Even the German police, accustomed to large-scale skulduggery, were startled by the magnitude of their transactions; single shipments were worth a million dollars and more. The German leader of the ring got his orders directly from a Russian control point in Berlin.

If tires that Moscow wanted, for example, could be bought in Western Germany, they would be purchased there for delivery to the ring's warehouse near the border. There they would be packed into cases labeled "scrap rubber" and sent by rail into the Soviet zone, where a Russian representative would readdress them to their final destination in the U. S. S. R. If the tires were not

obtainable in Germany, one of the partners would make the necessary arrangements in Switzerland, France, England, or even the United States to ship the goods to Germany.

Smaller and more critical materials, such as ball bearings or precision measuring instruments, were packed into trucks manned by heavily armed guards with whom the frontier guards rarely chose to tangle. One night, however, a German customs man who wanted to do his duty and became inquisitive over some cases labeled "preserves" was shot, and the police decided to do something about his murder. The chief muscle men of the gang were captured, and they told the story of the operation. The four head men, however, are still at large.

"And that's the way it is," one ECA man told me, "up and down the border. You can't rightly call it smuggling, it's so easy. The stuff we're trying to keep from Russia is just pouring across those frontiers every day."

In every major industrial city of Western Europe buyers subsidized by Soviet funds—often firms of the highest international reputation—serve the needs of Moscow's planners and their assistants in the satellite countries. Their profits are big. While the inefficiency of Russian industry has been greatly exaggerated, the relatively small number of engineers and expert mechanics in the U. S. S. R. cannot yet turn out certain machinery and metals in sufficient quantity to satisfy the enormous demands of Russian factories. Moscow is willing to pay far above the world price for these essentials—either in cash or kind. The Western European countries need Russian and Eastern European timber, fats, wheat, manganese. So they keep their export controls lax, often wink when they are violated.

Not long ago the Department of Commerce received an application from a well-known firm of American exporters to permit the shipment of three Worthington pavers to Switzerland. These are immense machines, costing about \$40,000, which pave a road or an airstrip with incredible speed. Because of their high military value, they are on the list of items which must be licensed for shipment anywhere and may not be consigned behind the iron curtain under any circumstances. But the Swiss importer convinced the United States firm that he was sincere in his promise that the pavers would remain in that country, our State Department was satisfied that all was in order, and Commerce granted the license. A few weeks later, however, the Commerce Department's enforcement branch—the understaffed and overworked agents of the Office of Industry and Commerce—received a tip from a European informant. Washington then alerted one of our attachés in Vienna, who hurried to the Austrian-German border at Salzburg. And sure enough, there were the three Worthington pavers, on freight cars en route from Switzerland to Budapest and the East. The Swiss Government explained that the pavers had never actually entered Switzerland, but went to the free port of Basel, and were transhipped to the East. The pavers will now be sold to an Italian firm with the approval of the American military government in Austria.

Last May a shipment of 144 barrels of molybdenum—a substance used to harden steel for jet engines, among other modern military devices—was duly licensed by the Commerce Department and left New York for Liverpool, consigned to a reputable British merchant. Again the C-men received a tip: The metal was to be transferred at Liverpool to the Russian freighter *Beloostrov*. Commerce cabled the American Embassy in London to prevent any transshipment, but the Embassy hesitated to precipitate an incident and the molybdenum was soon aboard the *Beloostrov* and on its way across the North Sea.

While neither of the American export firms involved in these cases knew where its shipment was ultimately going, the OIC's special agents keep catching exporters who do know. Some 80 concerns have been punished in the last 2 years for misrepresenting the final destination of strategic materials prohibited to the Communist areas. Not long ago Allied-Universal, a New York import-export firm, applied for a permit to ship 200,000 pounds of silicon-steel sheets to a company in the Netherlands for the manufacture of electric motors to be used in war-damaged factories of that country. The C-men, in a routine check-up, discovered not only that Allied-Universal's declaration was false but that the Dutch consignee had told the exporter that he intended to transship the steel directly to Hungary. Allied-Universal had replied that it didn't care where the steel went as long as it was paid for. This shipment was caught just in time; the steel stayed in the United States, and Allied-Universal was put out of business for 6 months by a United States Commissioner who suspended its export-license privileges.

In recent months the Commerce Department has finally begun to treat these offenders with some severity. A dozen exporters have been sent to jail for terms ranging from 3 months to 10 years, and almost 50 more criminal cases are pending. The Department is also putting more punch into its suspensions. The Edwards International Corp. of New York, which tried to export 3,000 truck tires to Rumania via Italy, was banned from European trade for 2 years. Another New York merchant dispatched to the U. S. S. R., through an agent in Switzerland, 20 tons of a chemical essential in the hardening of rubber. He was suspended from all trade abroad that requires licensing for the duration of our controls.

But the Office of Industry and Commerce has little more than a dozen enforcement officers to ride herd over the enormous volume of our export business. With at least a thousand important shipments of licensed goods a month from the Port of New York alone, they can give attention to only the most suspicious transactions. With devotion, often brilliant police work, and a round-the-clock schedule of work, this handful of men has prevented \$150,000,000 worth of strategic materials from reaching the U. S. S. R. in the last 2 years. They themselves assume that they must have missed shipments totaling a good deal more.

Abroad, the position of the ECA men charged with preventing the U. S. S. R. from taking advantage of the Marshall plan is even more difficult. They have no trained investigators at all. While the ECA is supposed, under our law, to penalize a government which tolerates trade in strategic materials with the U. S. S. R., it refuses to use any kind of big stick for fear of arousing resentment which the Russians might turn to political advantage. Many European businessmen accordingly have been quick to take advantage of that fact.

"I recently looked at a French plant, rebuilt with ECA funds," one ECA official with long experience in Europe told me. "They were making lathes for Poland. And they were perfectly frank about it. Lathes are not strategic machines according to French rules, they pointed out, and the product was not actually going to Russia. In their opinion, that made everything all right." The ECA man had submitted his report. "But the factory is still making lathes for Poland," he continued bitterly, "and if lathes aren't strategic machines and Poland isn't behind the Iron Curtain, I don't know what is."

Mounting criticism of the Government's policies in regard to western Europe's trade with the Communist countries has provoked the suggestion in Congress that ECA aid be withdrawn from any country trading with Russia in any material on our contraband

list. That proposal was voted down at the last session after President Truman, the ECA and the State and Commerce Departments all objected that such radical action would do us irreparable harm in Europe.

The State Department claims that negotiations with the governments participating in ECA are bringing about an amicable arrangement with regard to shipments to the U. S. S. R. But Commerce Department figures on west-east trade indicate no change. It would seem that the new Congress and the public should have a careful look at the extent of our military aid to Russia.

COMMUNICATION FROM MR. K. C. WU

Mr. Lecompte. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. Lecompte. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of Formosa is a man by the name of K. C. Wu, who spent several years of his early life in Iowa as a student at Grinnell College. Formosa, as we all know, is the seat of the Nationalist Government. Governor Wu, with the background of an Iowa education and several years spent in the environment of Iowa, of course, could have no part of communism in his make-up. He is a very sound statesman. I have a recent letter from him, in which he describes his efforts to establish representative government and government by elected public officers in the Taiwan Province of China. We are very anxious to aid the forces against communism in the Orient at this time. I feel certain that the Members of the House and particularly the members of the Foreign Relations Committee will be interested in this letter from Governor Wu, an alumnus of Grinnell College, the class of 1923, and whom I know personally, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that his letter may be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

I am having the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD sent to Governor Wu so that he may be acquainted with developments in Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

(The letter is as follows:)

TAIWAN PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT,
Taipei, Taiwan, China, November 23, 1950.
Mr. KARL M. Lecompte,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., U. S. A.

DEAR MR. Lecompte: Your letter dated November 3 has been duly received. I am very grateful to you for your assistance in making arrangements to have the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD mailed to me regularly.

I must also thank you for your kind expression of good will. There is no denying the fact that we have been confronted with many difficulties in these crucial times. During the past year we have been doing our best to overcome these difficulties, and I am sure you will be glad to know that our efforts have met with considerable success. As a result of the measures we have taken, including the appointment of more Taiwanese leaders to serve in the Government, curbing of inflation, control of commodity prices, increase of agricultural and industrial production, improvement of the tax system, issuance of

liberty bonds, reduction of land rentals, and enforcement of labor insurance, we have achieved political, economic, and social stability. The achievement of stability has enabled us to maintain peace and order throughout the island and increase Taiwan's security against Communist invasion. The people are contented and the morale of the armed forces is very high.

You may also be interested to know that we have already made a good start in inaugurating the popular election of officials of the local governments. During the last few months elections of district magistrates and members of municipal councils have been successfully held in various parts of Taiwan. The elections were free in every sense of the word. There was not the slightest interference from the governmental authorities, and great enthusiasm was displayed by both the candidates and the voters. We are highly gratified with the success thus far attained, which undoubtedly augurs well for the future of popular government in China.

Another thing I should like to tell you is that we are placing great stress on rule of law. The Government has directed that the liberties of the individual must be respected, and all persons tried in military courts will soon be permitted to have legal counsel. For many decades China's judicial system, in both theory and practice, has largely been dominated by the concepts of continental law, but now we have begun to adopt and emphasize the principles of Anglo-Saxon law, which holds that a man must be considered innocent until he is proved guilty.

Before closing I must add that in the achievement of stability on Taiwan we have been greatly benefited by American assistance. ECA aid has been particularly useful in the solution of our economic problems. There can be no doubt that with the American people's generous support, both moral and material, we shall not fail to tide over the present crisis and contribute our share to the democratic nations' joint efforts for checking Communist expansion.

Thanking you again for your letter and your sympathy, I remain,
Yours sincerely,

K. C. Wu.

REPORT FROM THE RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tonight to file a report on an application for a rule on the tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

REPORTS FROM THE LOBBYING INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, prior to election the Buchanan committee on lobbying put out propaganda complaining about Republicans who were sending out material under frank, which of course was frankable, but which was critical of the New Deal and the Communists.

The press has carried the statement that a member of that committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE], franked out four issues of a pamphlet containing labor propaganda against

Republicans. I wonder if the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE], who is on the floor, or the committee will give us a report on that matter. While they are doing that, will they look up and see if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] did not frank out some other Democratic propaganda. I am not critical of either of these gentlemen nor of what they did or did not do—my purpose is to have the whole story of record, for the Buchanan committee created and circulated the impression that members were doing something illegal or improper when they were not. Another purpose is to show how easy it is for material to be franked out through mistake. I am sure the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] can and will satisfactorily explain the situation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

REPORTS FROM LOBBY INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], I think I should answer right now; so as to stop a lot of false reports that were started by Fulton Lewis and by a certain newspaper reporter in Washington. Here is the fact which I ascertained, and today or tomorrow I shall be privileged to file, I think upon request, a statement by my executive secretary who had charge of such matters.

What happened, I am told by my executive secretary over her own signature—and I do not have that statement with me this morning because I did not realize the gentleman from Michigan was going to bring it up—but what happened, she reports to me, was that we had a policy in my office prior to the time I went back to California of mailing an A. F. of L. pamphlet of which we received a hundred copies for several weeks, but not under frank; but paying postage on them instead. When my executive secretary and No. 2 secretary and I all went back to California at recess before election date, we left in the office a junior secretary. We had asked that the A. F. of L. weekly, and all newspapers and such mail, 100 copies of which came to us a week, be transferred to my Long Beach office so that they could be used out there. A letter came from my junior secretary, addressed to the Long Beach office, asking what should be done with this accumulation of 3 or 4 weeks' issues of the A. F. of L. pamphlet which we did not know were being sent to the Washington office during the recent recess. I did not know of the inquiry coming.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is a perfectly satisfactory explanation. I just wanted to clear the record of any doubt. That could happen to any of us

or all of us. The charges made by the Buchanan committee against members are as easily and as satisfactorily explainable.

Mr. DOYLE. Let me continue for 1 minute more, with unanimous consent. We ascertained that this was the fact: My executive secretary, Miss Smith, answered to my junior secretary to mail those out. There was plenty of postage on hand in the Washington office. The junior secretary here at Washington mailed this A. F. of L. weekly to only 85 people, but she did mail the accumulation of 3 or 4 weeks. In other words, three or four hundred copies went to 85 people. Immediately upon its being discovered what had happened in the Long Beach office, I ordered that the postage be paid on those 85 mailings. It was immediately paid. There was no general mailing; it was one mailing to 85 people only, and certainly it was not done with my knowledge, my approval, or my consent. Neither I nor my executive secretary were in Washington.

Because these mailing details did not generally come to my attention, I asked my executive secretary to give me a signed statement as soon as she learned what the fact was. Following is a true and correct copy of an original statement by her under date of November 14, 1950:

LONG BEACH, CALIF., November 14, 1950.

As executive secretary for Congressman CLYDE DOYLE throughout the Eighty-first Congress, and on account of the criticism which has been directed toward him regarding the use of the frank, I am making the following statement:

I left Washington for California on Thursday, August 31, 1950. At that time the League Reporter was being mailed to approximately 85 people, postage prepaid and not under the frank. This number was not increased and neither was this policy changed. I did not know that any of them were being mailed under the frank after I left. This detail was never brought to the Congressman's attention. No matches were mailed.

When the Congressman was informed that the frank had been used to these 83 people on this one mailing, he immediately instructed me to remit the postage, which I have done.

RENE SEBRING SMITH,
Executive Secretary to Clyde Doyle,
Member of Congress, Eighteenth
Congressional District of California.

USE THE ATOM BOMB

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, ever since the atom bomb was first conceived, Americans have debated when and where and under what circumstances it should be used against the enemy.

Personally, I have always had a horror of this deadly weapon. I have maintained it should never be used against civilians and noncombatants. It should not be resorted to except under the most trying conditions, which might mean the

end of our very national existence unless we brought the atom bomb into play.

Probably there has never been such a wide divergence of views upon how effective the atom bomb really is. Those who delivered Japan the atomic blow which compelled her leaders to capitulate, claim that no power on earth can withstand this dread missile.

On the other hand, Jimmy Doolittle held there was not much more puissance in a standard-size atom bomb than in one giant blockbuster or in a ton of TNT.

Be that as it may, the atom bomb is still largely a secret weapon, the mere mention of which is capable of creating fear. Since it has never been brought out except on two or three momentous occasions, it is only natural we should decide to use it with the extremest regard.

But the news from Korea is black for 100,000 American boys there, struggling in deadly combat with hordes of savage fighters, and outnumbered 3 to 1 by the Chinese Communists.

If using the atom bomb means saving these young Americans in Korea, then I am all for using as many atom bombs as we need and just as soon as we can. Let us destroy the forces of evil which are slaughtering patriotic Americans and defend our soldiers with everything at our command.

I do not know of any greater exigency than when Uncle Sam's armies are threatened with annihilation. That is what will happen unless we go to their rescue. I say use the atom bomb in their defense.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts from the appendix of the report of the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the majority leader if there has been any change in the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentleman from Indiana asked that question. There will be a change. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, has introduced the tax bill that will be considered. The Ways and Means Committee has scheduled a meeting for 2 o'clock. If that committee reports a bill, the Committee on Rules will meet at 3 o'clock for the purpose of reporting a rule. If a rule is reported out, midnight tonight hav-

ing been obtained for the purpose of filing that rule, by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], in view of the importance of such legislation I would feel constrained to program it for Monday.

The other bill programed for consideration on Monday is on the program and will be taken up. Of course, every one, I am sure, appreciates the fact that legislation of more far reaching importance should be given preference when available for the consideration of the House. So in answer to the gentleman's inquiry, if the Ways and Means Committee reports out a bill and the Rules Committee reports a rule, which I reasonably expect, then the tax bill will be considered on Monday.

Mr. HALLECK. One further question that possibly the majority leader might answer for the benefit of the membership. He will recall that he and I discussed the matter of a roll call on Monday and had agreed there would be no roll call on Monday. That is, if we had a roll call we would endeavor to put it over until Tuesday. I take it, of course, that the time of voting on the tax bill, if it is taken up on Monday, will be dependent on the length of general debate granted under the rule. The majority leader will agree with me that in all probability the debate will be such that the vote will not come on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentleman from Indiana asked that question, because we did have an understanding with reference to the bill programed for Monday. The same understanding will apply in relation to the tax bill. If debate is finished on Monday, and if there is a roll call on passage, and it is reasonable to assume there will be, so far as I am concerned we will postpone that roll call until Tuesday. I am sure the other Members of the House will not interfere with the carrying out of that understanding.

Mr. HALLECK. I may suggest one other thing. From my experience I am quite sure that general debate will run beyond Monday anyway.

Mr. McCORMACK. That it is reasonable to assume, but in the event general debate is terminated and there is a roll call on final passage of the bill, the understanding of the leadership on both sides is that the roll call will take place on Tuesday.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Assuming, and this is only an assumption, an improbable one, that some maverick makes a point of no quorum, will we adjourn forthwith? Will a motion to adjourn come up right away?

Mr. McCORMACK. A quorum call is not a roll call. There is a clear line of demarcation between a roll call and a quorum call.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know there is.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman does, and I have a lot of appreciation for the humor of my friend.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If there is a point of order made on the vote, then that will go over?

Mr. McCORMACK. Where there is a main question involved, and on final vote, if there is not a quorum, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question. Since he has agreed that the tax bill will be taken up on Monday, if debate is finished and there is a roll call, the roll call will go over until Tuesday. May I ask, if the tax bill is taken up on Tuesday, then will the roll call go over until Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no. I mean if the debate is not closed on Monday, and there is a continuation of debate on the tax bill on Tuesday, of course we will go ahead to final completion. This applies only to Monday.

Mr. BONNER. Does the gentleman intend to finish the tax bill on Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I do not know what the length of time of debate will be. The understanding is that if the tax bill is concluded on Monday, that any roll call will go over until Tuesday. If debate is not concluded on Monday, then it will be continued on Tuesday, and we will go right ahead and conclude it.

Mr. BONNER. If you took the bill up on Tuesday, would you have the vote notwithstanding time for debate?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the bill cannot come up on Monday for any reason and it does come up on Tuesday, I would feel constrained to go ahead with the bill and conclude it without putting it over to another day for the roll call.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Mansfield News-Journal.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. RIVERS) was given permission to extend his remarks and include therewith an article on the distinguished new commander of the American Legion from Georgia, Hon. Erle Cocke, Jr.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include some excerpts.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. WAGNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article and an editorial from the New York Post.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter and a memorandum.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I received permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article. I have a report from the printer today stating that the article covers four and one-quarter pages and will cost \$348.50. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be extended in the Appendix of the RECORD to include this material, notwithstanding the additional cost.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding, and without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Chair to declare a recess at any time today subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess at this time subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE AND OTHER APPROPRIATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 726)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am today transmitting to the Congress a request for additional funds to strengthen our defenses. The gravity of the world situation requires that these funds be made available with the utmost speed.

I am recommending additional appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of 16.8 billion dollars. These funds are needed to support our part in the United Nations military action in Korea, and to increase the size and readiness of our Armed Forces should action become necessary in other parts of the world.

Together with the funds appropriated in the General Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1951, and those appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act for fiscal 1951, this will make a total of 41.8 billion dollars for the United States military forces for the current fiscal year.

I am also recommending a supplemental appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission in the amount of \$1,050,000,000. These funds will en-

able the Commission to enlarge its production capacity substantially. The new facilities will provide larger capacity for the production of fissionable materials, and for the fabrication of such materials into atomic weapons. The fissionable materials thus produced can be utilized either in weapons or as fuels for power-producing atomic reactors. The program for building these additional facilities has been developed after thorough study over the last few months.

The further expansion of our military forces and of our atomic energy enterprise are directed toward strengthening the defenses of the United States and of the entire free world. This expansion is a matter of great urgency, which can be understood and evaluated only against the background of present critical world conditions.

United States troops are now fighting as part of the United Nations command in Korea. They are fighting for freedom and against tyranny—for law and order and against brutal aggression. The attack of the North Korean Communists on their peaceful fellow-countrymen in June was in defiance of the United Nations and was an attack upon the security of peaceful nations everywhere. Their action, if unchecked, would have blasted all hope of a just and lasting peace—for if open aggression had been unopposed in Korea, it would have been an invitation to aggression elsewhere.

In that crisis, the United Nations acted, and the United States strongly supported that action—for the people of this country knew that our own freedom was as much at stake as the freedom of the Korean people. We knew that the issue was nothing less than the survival of freedom everywhere. If freemen did not stand together against aggression, there could be no hope for peace. This was essentially a moral decision. We did not hesitate, even though we knew we would have to operate at the end of lengthy supply lines, and would initially be faced with overwhelming odds.

There were serious reverses at first, but the courage and skill of our men, and those of other free nations, working together under brilliant leadership, drove the aggressors back.

It soon became evident that North Koreans alone could not have prepared the kind of well-organized, well-armed attack which was launched against the Republic of Korea. As Ambassador Austin proved in the Security Council of the United Nations, the aggressors were armed with Soviet Russian weapons. From the early days of the attack, it became clear that the North Korean forces were being supplemented and armed from across the frontier. Men and equipment were coming out of those dark places which lie behind the iron curtain.

As the United Nations forces continued to defeat the aggressors and continued to advance in their mission of liberation, Chinese Communist participation in the aggression became more blatant. General MacArthur, as commander of the United Nations forces, reported to the United Nations Security Council on November 5 the proof of this participation.

Despite this outside Communist aid, United Nations troops were well on the way to success in their mission of restoring peace and independence in Korea when the Chinese Communists a few days ago sent their troops into action on a large scale on the side of the aggressor.

The present aggression is thus revealed as a long-calculated move to defy the United Nations and to destroy the Republic of Korea which was giving a demonstration to the peoples of Asia of the advantages of life in an independent, national, non-Communist state.

The present attack on the United Nations forces by the Chinese Communists is a new act of aggression—equally as naked, deliberate, and unprovoked as the earlier aggression of the North Korean Communists. Cutting through the fog of Communist propaganda, this fact stands unmistakably clear: The Chinese Communists, without a shadow of justification, crossed the border of a neighboring country and attacked United Nations troops who were on a mission to restore peace under the direction of the organization representing mankind's best hope for freedom and justice.

The Chinese Communists have acted presumably with full knowledge of the dreadful consequences their action may bring on them. The Chinese people have been engaged in fighting within their own country for years, and in the process their lands and factories have been laid waste, and their young men killed. Nothing but further misery can come to the Chinese people from the reckless course of aggression into which they have been led by the Communists.

The United Nations resolutions, the statements of responsible officials in every free country, the actions of the United Nations command in Korea, all have proved beyond any possible misunderstanding that the United Nations action in Korea presented no threat to legitimate Chinese interests. The United States especially has a long history of friendship for the Chinese people and support for Chinese independence. There is no conceivable justification for the attack of the Chinese Communists upon the United Nations forces.

The only explanation is that these Chinese have been misled or forced into their reckless attack—an act which can only bring tragedy to themselves—to further the imperialist designs of the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless, the Chinese Communists have acted, and they must bear the responsibility for those acts. They have attacked a United Nations force composed of men from Australia, Canada, France, Korea, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Philippines, South Africa, Thailand, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The United Nations force they have attacked includes also Indian and Swedish hospital units. It is a force now being supplemented by troops from Belgium, Colombia, Greece, and Luxembourg. Fifty-three members of the United Nations are supporting this common effort to stop aggression. The Chinese Communists struck at all of these countries when they started to make war against the United Nations.

The United Nations troops are defending themselves vigorously, and will do so with increasing effectiveness as their forces regroup. At Lake Success the United Nations is now considering how best to halt this new aggression and bring to an end the fighting in Korea.

Meanwhile, two facts are clear.

First, the moral issue now is the same as it was in June. The aggression of the Chinese Communists is a direct assault upon the United Nations and upon the principles of international law and order which are its foundation. By their action the Chinese Communist leaders have proved themselves lawbreakers in the community of nations. If there is to be any hope for world peace the nations which truly want peace must stand together in opposing this new aggression, just as they did in opposing the original attack from North Korea.

Second, this aggression casts a more ominous shadow over the prospects for world peace. We see no issue between the Chinese Communists and the free nations, or between the Soviet Union and the free nations, which could not be honorably solved by peaceful means. We continue to stand ready in good faith to seek solutions in that way. But the Chinese Communist leaders, who are known to be in close relations with the Kremlin, have not hesitated to make a large-scale assault upon United Nations troops. The leaders of Communist imperialism could not help but know that this action involved grave risk of world war. Their present aggressive actions seem utterly inconsistent with any peaceful intention.

In the face of this situation, the United States and the other free nations have no choice but to increase their military strength very rapidly. As free men, dedicated to the peaceful advancement of human well-being, we have not made this choice gladly. But we have made it firmly and definitely, and we will not falter or turn back.

Prior to this new act of aggression by the Chinese Communists, a supplemental estimate of appropriations for our Armed Forces was being prepared. This supplemental estimate, which I am transmitting to the Congress today, provides for large additional appropriations for the current fiscal year.

When the Communists of North Korea brutally assaulted the Republic of Korea last June, the strength of our armed forces stood at approximately 1,500,000 men and women; today, 5 months later, the manpower strength of our Armed Forces has been increased by more than 50 percent, to more than 2,250,000 men and women; and our goal, until this most recent act of aggression, has been a strength of 2,800,000 by the end of the current fiscal year. Now we face the necessity of having to raise our sights, both in terms of manpower and in terms of production.

This prospect makes it essential that the funds I am now requesting be made available speedily in order to build up our military strength as rapidly as possible. About \$9,000,000,000 of these new funds will be used for major military

procurement, and to expand facilities for military production.

The appropriation request I am transmitting today is not a war budget. That would obviously require far more money.

However, the immediate appropriation of these funds will permit us to make the fastest possible progress in increasing our strength. This action will permit us to go ahead at once to step up rapidly the size of the Armed Forces and the rate of military training. It will permit us to go ahead at once to increase rapidly the rate of production of planes, tanks and other military equipment. At the same time, we can be going ahead with plans for such further expansion as may be necessary, and any additional funds required for that purpose can be requested when and as such plans are worked out.

These measures will put us in a position to move speedily into an increased state of mobilization if the situation grows worse. If the situation improves, we can level off the size of forces and the rate of production of military goods as may be appropriate. In any case, we must be prepared to endure a long period of tension.

I wish to emphasize again, as I have before, that the situation we are in requires from every one of us the utmost devotion and willingness to do his part. In this critical time, the national interest is paramount, and all partisan or selfish considerations must be subordinated.

The United States is today strong and free. Whatever may come, I know the people of this country will do everything in their power to increase that strength and protect our precious freedom.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 1, 1950.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio (at the request of Mr. CLEVINGER) was given permission to extend his remarks.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, December 4, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1760. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of \$17,978,247,000 for the Atomic Energy

Commission, Tennessee Valley Authority, and Department of Defense, together with certain proposed provisions and increases in limitations pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 727), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 872. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9827, a bill to provide revenue by imposing a corporate excess-profits tax, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3141). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 9827. A bill to provide revenue by imposing a corporate excess-profits tax, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 9827. A bill to provide revenue by imposing a corporate excess-profits tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 9828. A bill to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of Labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 9829. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 9830. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 9831. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 9832. A bill to remove marketing penalties on certain long-staple cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 9833. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 9834. A bill to authorize the construction of a 60,000-ton aircraft carrier; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9835. A bill to authorize the acceptance of conditional gifts to further the defense effort; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. J. Res. 549. Joint resolution providing that a copy of the document entitled "Survival Under Atomic Attack" shall be furnished to every home in the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 9836. A bill to provide for the admission of Dr. Karl Schaefer to United States citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. R. 9837. A bill to provide for the extension of design patent No. 133,870, issued September 22, 1942, to Mrs. Beulah Hill relating to a Bootlette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9838. A bill for the relief of Irene T. Mitchell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 9839. A bill for the relief of Julio Henrique Da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1950

(Legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, by whom the meek are guided in judgment and light riseth up in darkness for the godly, grant us in all doubts and uncertainties the grace to ask what Thou wouldst have us to do, that the spirit of wisdom may save us from all false choices and that in Thy light we may see light and in Thy straight path may not stumble.

Bowing in this storied Chamber we are conscious that we are heirs of great traditions. We are conscious, too, of a listening world, hoping in its agony that the horror of global war may be averted. In this mad and sad day filled with the angry accents of hate, we humbly bow at the beginning of this fateful week with the deathless assurance that can turn even seeming tragedy to triumph: "The eternal God is our refuge and underneath are the everlasting arms." We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 1, 1950, was dispensed with.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. TOBEY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until Thursday on official business of the Committee on Small Business.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CARLSON was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate Wednesday and Thursday to attend the annual meeting of the Council of State Governments, of which he is the chairman.

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. McCARRAN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for an indefinite period.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

SENATOR FROM CALIFORNIA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a telegram from the Governor of California, the Honorable Earl Warren, and I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegram will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., December 3, 1950.
SECRETARY OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

This is to advise you that on December 1, 1950, I appointed RICHARD M. NIXON United States Senator to fill the unexpired term of United States Senator Sheridan Downey in the Eighty-first Congress. On that same date, I mailed Senator Nixon's commission to him at Washington, D. C.

EARL WARREN,
Governor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator-elect is present in the Chamber, and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to take the oath of office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none. If the Senator-elect will come forward, the Chair will administer the oath of office to him.

Mr. NIXON, escorted by Mr. KNOWLAND, advanced to the desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hoey	Mundt
Anderson	Holland	Neely
Bricker	Hunt	Nixon
Butler	Ives	O'Connor
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Capehart	Kefauver	Russell
Carlson	Kerr	Saltonstall
Chapman	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Chavez	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Clements	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Connally	Leahy	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Lehman	Stennis
Donnell	Long	Taft
Dworshak	Lucas	Taylor
Eastland	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Eaton	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McFarland	Thye
Fulbright	McKellar	Tydings
George	McMahon	Watkins
Gillette	Magnuson	Wherry
Gurney	Malone	Wiley
Hayden	Maybank	Williams
Hendrickson	Millikin	Young
Hickenlooper	Morse	
Hill		

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the Senate to

attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a representative of the United States to the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed as a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNERT] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent by leave of the Senate as a delegate of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Small Business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

RENEWAL OF PROGRAM OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION FOR DISABLED VETERANS (H. DOC. NO. 728)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has a communication from the President of the United States, which is really meant for the Senate. The clerk will read the communication.

The Chief Clerk read the communication, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 4, 1950.
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I wish to recommend action in the present session to renew the program of vocational rehabilitation for disabled veterans, which was in effect during and after World War II. Since the Armed Forces are